ON
HAPLOLOGY
IN
INDO-EUROPEAN

BY GEORGE CARDONA

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS
PHILADELPHIA

Copyright © 1968 by the Trustees of the
University of Pennsylvania
Publication of this book has been aided
by a grant from the Haney Foundation of
the University of Pennsylvania
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 68-21552

7570
Printed in the United States of America

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is my pleasant obligation to thank those who have contributed to the completion and publication of this monograph. My colleague Henry Hoenigswald has again placed me in his debt by reading the manuscript. I also owe him a broader debt for the stimulus of his work and for frequent personal discussions. The manuscript was also read by K. M. Tiwary, to whom I am grateful for suggestions which, I think, have made several passages clearer.

The members of the Haney Foundation Editorial Committee and its chairman, Dr. Rudolf Hirsch, have been most gracious in accepting this monograph for publication in their series. Suggestions concerning the form of the monograph were also made by an external reader selected by the Haney Foundation Editorial Committee; I wish to thank the reader, whose suggestions I have incorporated in the work.

Finally, I would express my appreciation to the members of the University of Pennsylvania Press, who were most generous with their time and advice: its director, Gordon Hubel, and Miss Jane Alles, who prepared the manuscript for print.

INTRODUCTION

This study began as an investigation into a particular problem of Sanskrit grammar, namely the conditions underlying some peculiarities in the forms of Vedic feminine stems in *-yá-*. In Vedic, as in classical Sanskrit, a feminine *-ā́*-stem regularly has an instrumental singular form in *-áyā* (e.g. *śravasyáyā* from *śravasyā́-* 'eloquence'). However, instrumental singular forms such as *śravasyā́* (< *śravasyā́-*), formed to feminine *-ā́*-stems in which the *-ā-* is immediately preceded by *-y-*, are quite common in Vedic. Such forms are usually explained as haplologic shortenings of forms in *-yáyā* (§3). Since there are paradigmatic forms of feminine *-yā́*-stems in which the conditions for haplology occurred (e.g. loc. sg. in *-yāyām*) but haplologically shortened forms were not generalized, it is worthwhile looking into the conditions underlying the distinction between the Vedic forms of *-yā́*-stems in which haplologized variants prevailed and those in which full forms prevailed. In this connection I had to consider the Vedic *-si* forms, such as *jeṣi* 'conquer', *neṣi* 'lead', *párṣi* 'transport', *yákṣi* 'sacrifice', *vákṣi* 'carry', since Szemerényi (1966) has recently suggested that all such forms are haplologic shortenings of subjunctive forms in *-sasi* (§ 5). The particular problem assumes wider implications, since Szemerényi's explanation of the *-si* forms implies that formal isolation consequent on phonologic change—in this case haplology—can of itself result in a shift of function.

Part of the stimulus for a wider study came from a paper by Hoenigswald (1964), in which he expresses the conviction, with which I agree, that the traditional distinction made between major and minor processes of sound change is untenable (see § 6).

In the present study, I consider two major examples of haplologic shortening in forms of a paradigm: the Vedic *-yā́* forms and the Latin perfects of the type *dixti* 'said'. The two differ. The *-yā́* forms of Vedic are extremely common and have in effect predominated over the expected forms in *-yā́yā* within a certain subsystem of the Vedic nominal system. In Latin, on the other hand, the type *dixti* never predominated over, though it did coexist with, the fuller type *dixisti,* and in Romance the full form type *dixisti* became the norm. In the Indic development we see the result of an interplay between forms in *-yā́* < *-yā́yā* and homophonous forms with the instrumental suffix *-yā́.* The haplologized forms are thus supported by other forms within the same subsystem. On the other hand, the Latin forms of the type *dixti* had no such support. To explain the continued use by Latin speakers of the type *dixti,* it is necessary to consider also the factor of the frequency with which conditions for haplologic shortening occurred in the Latin *-s*-perfect. For a conditioned sound change such as haplologic shortening, then, it is necessary to consider not just a linguistic system en masse but its subsystems and the conditions prevailing within them. If, as I think is correct, haplology is not essentially separable from regular sound change amenable to formulation in terms of what are called sound laws, these observations have consequences for our views of regular sound change.

I begin with a detailed study of the pertinent Vedic

-yá forms (§1), considering the subgroups of denominative verbs from which are derived abstract stems in *-yā́-* (§ § 1.1-1.4). I then consider syntactic problems associated with the Vedic *-yá* forms (§ § 2.-2.2). It is shown that, consonant with the description of Indian grammarians (fn. 46), we have to recognize an instrumental suffix *-yā́* for Vedic (§ 2.3); in addition, an instrumental suffix *-tā* should be recognized (§ § 2.3-2.4). I then consider (§ 3) the interrelation of hapologized forms in *-yá* < *-yáyā* and forms with the suffix *-yá* to show that the accepted explanation by mere haplology is insufficient. The results obtained from this discussion lead to a reformulation of the conditions for haplologic shortening in Indo-European generally (§ 4) and a discussion of the effects of this change in the Latin type *dixti* (§ 4.1). These considerations afford a background for a reconsideration of the historical development to be posited for the Vedic imperatives in *-si* (§ 5). Finally, the conclusions reached while considering the Vedic *-yá* forms, the Latin perfect type *dixti,* and the Vedic *-si* imperatives are generalized and some comments made (§ 6) with reference to sound change in general, at least in the context of Indo-European (cf. fn. 63).*

Nota Bene: A sequence of three Arabic numerals (e.g. 1.1.1.) with no further indication refers to a passage from the Rigveda. Abbreviations used for other references are given in the list of references.

*The typescript of the present work was ready on 14 March 1967. The following reached me afterwards: Renou, Louis. *Etudes védiques et paṇinéennes* 17. Paris, 1967; Insler 1966['67]. Though some of the passages I have considered are touched on in *EVP* 17, the late Renou's treatment did not require me to make any substantive changes in my own work. Hence I have omitted *EVP* 17 from the list of references. Insler's article resulted in the addition of footnote 42 of the present work. The finished typescript, incorporating various suggestions of readers, was ready on 21 August and submitted to the press in September 1967.

ON HAPLOLOGY IN INDO-EUROPEAN

1. There is in Vedic a group of instrumental singular forms of feminine *-yā́*-stems which end in *-yā́* instead of the expected *-yáyā*. In some cases both forms of a single noun are used (e.g. *vacasyā́, vacasyáyā* from *vacasyā́-* 'eloquence'). The largest single group of such *-yā́* forms belongs to a system which includes: a verb stem (usually denominative) in *-yá-* (e.g. *vacasyá-* 'utter [religious] speech'), an agent noun or adjective in *-yú-* (e.g. *vacasyú-* 'eloquent'), and an action noun in *-yā́-* (e.g. acc. sg. *vacasyā́m*).

We must distinguish subgroups of denominative verbs in this major group according to their meaning, that is, according to what construction of verb and noun is equivalent to the denominative verb derived from the same noun. For example, *gavyá-* 'desire, seek after cows' is equivalent to *go-* 'cow' construed with *iṣ* 'desire' or *vī* 'pursue' (see § 1.1a and fn. 1); *vacasyá-* is equivalent to *vácas-* 'word, speech' construed with *brū* 'speak', or *arc* 'chant' (see § 1.2b).

1.1. The first group contains verb stems with the meaning 'desire, seek after', that is, the type *gavyá-* mentioned in § 1.[1]

1.1a. We may conveniently begin with a series of verbs used in connection with the wealth the Vedic poets typically sought. Indra is implored to make clear the path to wealth; the gift sought is that of cows (*go-*), horses (*áśva-*) and chariots (*rátha-*). 7.27.5a-c: *nū́ indra rāyé várivaskṛdhī na ā́ te máno vavṛtyāma maghā́ya/ gómadáśvāvadráthava-*

dvyánto ... 'Do you now, Indra, make for us a clear path unto wealth; we would turn your spirit to bounty hither, as we pursue (the gift of) cows, horses, chariots.'[2] Similarly, but using the denominative verb, it is said that those who seek these gifts draw Indra to friendship toward them as one draws a full bucket; 4.17.16: *gavyánta índraṃ sakhyā́ya víprā aśvayánto ... vājáyantah/ ... ákṣitotimā́ cyāvayāmo'vaté ná kóśam* 'We inspired chanters, seeking cows, horses, prizes of battle, draw Indra ... to friendship, (draw him) like a bucket in a well, him whose aid is indestructible.'[3] The seekers call to Indra; 7.32.23cd: *aśvāyánto maghavannindra ... gavyántastvā havāmahe* 'Seeking horses, bountiful Indra, seeking cows, do we call unto you.' And Indra, in seeking himself these gifts for those who call on him and befriend him, makes clear path for them; 8.46.10: *gavyó ṣú ṇo yáthā purā́śvayótá rathayā́/ varivasya* ... 'In quest of cows, as before, in quest of horses, of chariots, do you make a clear path for us ...' For Indra is the seeker of these gifts for those who call on him; his is dominion over these gifts, he grants them; 7.31.3: *tvám̐ na indra vājayústvaṃ gavyúḥ . . ./ tvám̐ hiraṇyayúḥ* ... 'You, Indra are for us the seeker of prizes, seeker of cows, you are seeker of gold ...'; 1.51.14cd: *aśvayúrgavyū́ rathayúríndra ídrāyáḥ kṣayati prayantā́* 'Seeker of horses, cows, chariots, Indra has dominion over wealth, dispenses it.'[4]

Soma is similarly referred to. 9.36.6: *ā́ divásp ṛṣṭhámaśvayúrgavyayúḥ soma rohasi/ vīrayúḥ* ... 'To the back of heaven do you mount, Soma, seeking horses, cows, heroic sons'; 9.64.4: *ásṛkṣataprá vājíno gavyā́ sómāso aśvayā́/ śukrā́so vīrayā́śavaḥ* 'The rapid steeds have been loosed, brilliant Soma streams, in quest of cows, horses, heroic sons'; cf. 9.64.3c: *ví no rāyé dúro vṛdhi* 'Open for us the doors to wealth.' For Soma, when purified, gives heroic sons; 1.91.20b: *sómo vīrám̥ ... dadāti* 'Soma gives heroic sons'; 9.97.44b: *vīrám̥ ca na ā́ pavasvā* 'Clarify yourself (to give) us heroic sons.'[5]

In 9.36.6, cited in the last paragraph, instead of *gavyú-* the form which occurs is from a stem *gavyayú-*. This derives from the adjective *gávya-* (also *gavyá-*) 'consisting of cows'; e.g. 7.92.3cd: *ní no rayím̥ ... yuvasva ní vīrám̥ gávyamáśvyam̥ ca rā́dhaḥ* 'Hold down to us wealth ..., heroic sons, a gift consisting of cows, of horses.' There is also a *-yā́* instrumental *gavyayā́;* 8.93.16-7: *śrutám̥ vo vṛtrahántamam .../ ā́ śuṣe rā́dhase mahé/ ayā́ dhiyā́ ca gavyayā́ púrunāman púruṣṭuta/ yátsómesoma ā́bhavaḥ* 'I call (with breathy hymn recitation)[6] your ... (Indra,) supreme slayer of Vṛtra, unto great gift (giving); through this thought(-poem), this desire for (gifts consisting in) cows, you many named, praised by many, since you were at Soma (pressing) after Soma (pressing).' It is not absolutely necessary to set up a denominative *gavyayá-* to account for *gavyayú-* and *gavyayā́,* since these could have been formed to *gávya-/ gavyá-* on the basis of *gavyú-* and *gavyā́.*

1.1b. As noted in § 1.1a, the poets sought heroic sons (*vīrá-*), which the gods were implored to grant; cf. 5.57.7, noted in fn. 2. From a denominative *vīrayá-* 'seek heroic sons'[7] are derived *vīrayú-* (9.36.6, above, § 1.1a) and *vīrayā́-*. In addition to 9.64.4 (§ 1.1a), the instrumental *vīrayā́* occurs in 7.90.1ab: *prá vīrayā́ śúcayo dadrire vāmadhvaryúbhirmadhúmantaḥ sutā́saḥ* 'The bright, honeyed, pressed (Soma juices) are set forth for you (Indra and Vāyu) by the sacrificers, in quest of heroic sons.' Compare 7.92.3d (to Vāyu) cited in § 1.1a.

1.1c. Wealth or treasure (*vásu-*) is sought by praising the gods. In 4.16.15a it is said that 'the desires have gone unto Indra seeking wealth' (*índraṃ kā́mā vasūyánto agman*); compare 8.78.9: *tvā́mid* ... *máma kā́mo gavyúr-hiraṇyayúḥ/ tvā́maśvayúréṣate* 'Unto you, (Indra,) does my desire, seeking cows, gold, to you, seeking horses, does it hasten.' Indra is *vasūyú-* for those who befriend him; see 1.51.14 cited in § 1.1a. The Aśvin are also thus implored in 8.8.16: *prā́smā ū́rjaṃ ghṛtaścútam* ... *yacchatam* .../ *yó vāṃ sumnā́ya tuṣṭávadvasūyā́t* 'Grant ghee-dripping nourishment to him who sings praises for your favor, who seeks treasure.' The instrumental *vasūyā́* occurs twice. In one passage it is used with reference to the Marut; 1.165.1cd: *káyā matī́ kúta étāsa etḗ'rcanti śúṣmaṃ vṛ́ṣaṇo vasūyā́* 'With what thought, whence come, do these bulls chant their (war) cry in quest of treasure?'[8] The second passage is 1.97.2ab: *sukṣetriyā́ sugātuyā́ vasūyā́ ca yajāmahe* 'We sacrifice (,Agni,) in quest of good fields, clear paths, wealth.'[9]

1.1d. From *śrávas-* 'renown' are formed *śravasyá-* 'seek renown' and its derivatives, *śravasyú-*, *śravasyā́-*. The latter occurs in two passages depicting battle scenes; 6.27.6ab: *triṃśácchataṃ varmíṇa* ... *sākáṃ yavyā́vatyām* ... *śravasyā́* '... 130 armored warriors together at the Yavāvatī in quest of fame'; 7.18.11ab: *ékaṃ ca yó viṃśatíṃ ca śravasyā́ vaikarṇáyorjánānrā́jā nyastaḥ* 'The king (Sudās) who laid low one and twenty of the men of the Vaikarṇa ...' Similarly, Indra, in his battle against Vṛtra, is said to have crushed him 'with a spirit intent on renown' (10.147.2b: *śravasyatā́ mánasā*). In his search for renown the chanter magnifies Indra as his potent formulas (*bráhman*) rise; 7.23.1: *údu bráhmāṇyairata śravasyéndraṃ ... mahayā vasiṣṭha* 'The *brahman* have risen; in quest of renown, do you, Vasiṣṭha, magnify Indra.' Similarly a poet says, 'I curry with my tongue a chant to Indra like a steed, in search of fame' (1.61.5ab: ... *sáptimiva śravasyéndrāyārkáṃ juhvā́ sámañje*).[10] And desires go to Indra not only in search of treasure (*vasūyántaḥ* 4.16.15a, § 1.1c) but also seeking renown (4.16.15c: *śravasyávaḥ*). For fame consists in part in possessing cows, heroes, prizes of battle; 1.9.7: *sáṃ gómadindra vā́javadasme pṛthú śrávo bṛhát/ ... dhehyákṣitam* Make us, Indra, renown rich in cows, in booty, widespread, great, indestructible'; 4.36.9: *ihá prajā́mihá rayím ... ihá śrávo vīrávattakṣatā naḥ/ yéna vayám citáyemā́tyanyā́ntáṃ vā́jaṃ citráṃ ṛbhavo dadā naḥ* 'Make for us here progeny, wealth, fame rich in heroes; give us, Ṛbhus, brilliant booty by which we might stand out over others.' As the soma juices are likened to horses in quest of battle prizes (9.64.4, § 1.1a), so in 9.96.16cd is Soma implored to speed to booty like a horse, in quest of renown (*abhí vā́jam* [*arṣa,* b] *sáptiriva śravasyā́*).

In 1.149.5, *śravasyā́* is used in connection with Agni: *ayáṃ sá hótā yó dvijánmā víśvā dadhé vā́ryāṇi śravasyā́/ márto yó asmai ... dadā́śa* 'This is the Hotṛ of two births, who holds all choice treasures, for fame, (as does) the mortal who does homage to him ...'[11] Also of Agni, it is said (1.128.6): ... *vásur dadhe háste dákṣiṇe taráṇirná śiśrathacchravasyáyā ná śiśrathat/ vísvasmā íd iṣudhyaté devatrā́ havyámóhiṣe/ víśvasmā ítsukṛ́te vā́ramṛṇvatyagnírdvā́rā vyṛṇvati* 'Treasure (personified, Agni) holds (all treasures) in his right hand; sweeping forth, he does not loose (them), does not loose (them); for any who implores, you (Agni) carry oblations to the gods; for any well doer (Agni) sends choice (gifts), opens the doors (to treasure, cf. 9.64.3, § 1.1a).'[12]

1.1e. In § 1.1c a passage was cited (8.8.16) in which is mentioned one who chants praises for the favor (*sumná-*) of the gods. This *sumná-*[13] is sought, since, by gaining it, the chanter goes on to gain the rewards he seeks. 2.11.16: *bṛhánta innú yé te ... ukthébhir ... sumnámāvívāsān/ stṛṇānā́so barhíḥ ... tvótā ídindra vā́jamagman* 'Great are they who with hymns seek to win your favor; who spread the *barhis;* with your help, Indra, they attained booty.'[14] Seeking this *sumná-* is also expressed by the denominative verb *sumnā̆yá-*. In 1.138, the poet begins by saying, 'Seeking his (Pūṣan's) favor, I address a hymn to him whose aid is near' (1d: *árcāmi sumnayánnahámántyūtim*). The purpose is to attract the god (4de: *ó ṣú tvā vavṛtīmahi stómebhir ... sādhúbhiḥ* 'We would attract you with effective praises.') so that he be kindly disposed (4b: *áheḷamānaḥ*) and 'be present for obtaining prizes' (4a: ... *úpa sātáye bhuvaḥ*) by those who seek fame (4c: *śravasyatā́m*). Similarly, *sumnayú-* refers to the chanter who, by prayer, seeks to gain the favor of the gods; e.g. 2.30.11: ... *śárdhaṃ mā́rutaṃ sumnayúr girópa bruve námasā .../ yáthā rayíṃ sárvavīraṃ náśāmahā ... śrútyaṃ divé dive* 'Respectfully do I in search of their favor address with hymn the Marut host, that we might attain wealth rich in heroes, famed each day.'[15] The abstract *sumnayā́-* occurs in 10.101.4,[16] a hymn in which the activities of the chanters are clothed in the activities of everyday agriculture: *sī́rā yuñjanti kaváyo yugā́ ví tanvate pṛ́thak/ dhī́rā devéṣu* *sumnayā́* 'The seers join the plows (to the oxen), spread separately the yokes (on them), the wise, in quest of favor among the gods.' On *sumnayā́* in AV 7.55.1 see § 2.

1.1f. Of course the Vedic poets are said to seek after the gods. The verb used to express this is *devayá-*, on which see most recently Gonda 1966. More specifically, the denominative *tvāyá-* is used to express the longing for a god addressed as *tvám* 'you'. Thus the chanter calls to Indra with mind intent on him; 6.40.3cd: *tvāyatā́ mánasā johavīmī́ndrā́ yāhi suvitáye mahé naḥ* 'With mind intent on you do I call; Indra, come for our great well-being.' With *tvāyatā́ mánasā* compare *śravasyatā́ mánasā* (above, § 1.1d) and *gavyatā́ mánasā* (e.g., 6.46.10a) 'with mind intent on cows.' *Tvāyá-* is the equivalent of *tvā́ṃ vaś* 'desire you'; e.g. 1.2.4: *índravāyū imé sutā́ ... índavo vāmuśánti hí* 'Indra and Vāyu, here are the pressed (soma juices) ...; the drops desire you'; 1.3.4ab: *índrā́ yāhi ... sutā́ imé tvāyávaḥ* 'Indra, come ...; these pressed (soma juices) desire you.' The corresponding adjectival is *tvāyú-*, as in the last verse and in 3.41.7: *vayámindra tvāyávo haviṣmanto jarāmahe/ utá tvámasmayúr* ... 'We chant, Indra, performing oblations, seeking you; and you (do also return the chant,)[17] seeking us.' The derivative abstract is *tvāyā́-*, whence an instrumental singular *tvāyā́*. This or a form homophonous with it (see § 2) occurs ten times in the Rigveda. In 2.18, after a series of exhortations to Indra that he come to the drinking of Soma, the poet says (6cd): *ayáṃ hí te sóma ... indra tvāyā́ páriṣikto mádāya* 'For you, Indra, has this Soma been poured round ... for your intoxication, in search of you.' See also § 2.2. The full intention is brought out by verse 7: *máma bráhmendra yāhyácchā .../ purutrā́ hí víhavyo babhū́-*

thāsmín ... *sávane mādayasva* 'Indra, approach my formula ...; for you are called by many in many places; intoxicate yourself at this pressing.' Of similar tenor are 1.101.8cd: ... *ā́ yāhyadhvarám̥ no ácchā tvāyā́ havíścakṛmā* 'Come to our sacrifice; for you have we performed oblation'; 1.101.9a: *tvāyéndra sómam̥ suṣumā* ... *havíścakṛmā* ... 'For you, Indra, have we pressed Soma, performed oblation.'

Tvāyā́ is also used when describing what the sacrificer does to obtain Agni's protection; 4.2.6: *yásta idhmám̥ jabháratsiṣvidānó murdhā́nam̥ vā tatápate tvāyā́/ bhúvastásya* ... *pāyúragne viśvasmāt sīmaghāyatá uruṣya* 'Agni, be his protector, guard him from any who would harm him, who brings firewood for you, sweating, lets his head become hot for you.'[18] In 4.2.14, on which see Lüders 514, it is also a question of what the sacrificers 'have done for (in quest of) you, Agni' (ab: ... *yádvayámagne tvāyā́* ... *cakṛmā́*).[19]

1.2. There is, next, a group of denominative verbs in *-yá-* which are equivalent in meaning to phrases containing the base nominal in construction with one or other of the verbs *kṛ* 'do, make', *dhā* 'place', *dā* 'give', *rā* 'grant.'

1.2a. From *dúvas-* 'gift' is derived *duvasyá-* 'present a gift'; e.g., 3.2.8ab: *namasyáta* ... *svadhvarám̥ duvasyáta* ... *jātávedasam* 'Do homage ... to him (Agni) who makes the sacrifice effective, do gift-giving (i.e. honor) to Jātavedas'; 6.15.6a: *agnímagnim̥ vaḥ samídhā duvasyata* 'Do gift-giving to fire after fire of yours with firewood.' *Duvasyá-* is equivalent to *dúvas kṛ, dhā,* as in 4.2.9: *yástúbhyamagne amṛ́tāya dā́śaddúvastvé kṛṇávate yatásruk/ ná sa rāyā́ śaśamānó ví yoṣannainamám̥haḥ pári varadaghāyóḥ* 'Agni, who renders proper treatment to you, immortal, who, (sacrificial) ladle set, places a gift in you, he, exerting himself (at the sacrifice), is not separated from wealth, him does not surround the danger of one who wills him ill';[20] 4.8.6c: ... *yé agnā́ dadhiré dúvaḥ* 'who placed a gift on Agni.'[21] The *-u-* derivative has two shapes: *duvasyú-* (8.102.2b, 10.100.12d) and *duvoyú-* (6.36.5a). The abstract *duvoyā́-* occurs once (5.36.6cd) in what is pretty clearly a *dānastuti* and where *duvoyā́* is most simply interpreted as meaning 'with veneration' or something similar (cf. note 21): *yū́ne sámasmai kṣitáyo namantāṃ śrutárathāya maruto duvoyā́* 'Marut, let the settlements bow to him, Śrutaratha, with veneration.'

1.2b. The verb *vacasyá-* is derived from *vácas-* 'word, speech', more specifically 'poetico-religious speech'. This noun occurs construed with *brū* 'speak' (1.84.19d) *arc* 'chant' (1.101.1a) and *takṣ* (6.32.1d); compare the use of *bráhman-* 'potent formula' with *arc* (5.85.1ab), *takṣ* (10.80.7a) and the use of *stóma-* 'praise' with *brū* (3.54.10a), *arc* (6.16.22), and *takṣ* (5.2.11ab). The *-u-* derivative *vacasyú-* denotes one who uses such speech; 1.182.3d: *jyótirviprāya kṛṇutaṃ vacasyáve* 'Do you two (Aśvin) make brilliance for the inspired chanter, speaker of sacrificial speech.' In 1.51.13 the dative *vacasyáve* occurs in context with *sunvaté* 'to him who presses Soma.' In 9.99.6d the finite form *vacasyate* is used with reference to Soma, who is master of poetic thought: *pátirvacasyate dhiyáḥ* 'The master of poetic thought speaks (out the poetic thought)'; cf. 9.75.2b: *vaktā́ pátir dhiyó asyā́ḥ* 'The speaker of, master of, this poetic thought' and see Gonda 1963:74. The shading 'eloquent' may be found in 5.14.6: *agníṃ ghṛténa vāvṛdhuḥ stómebhir .../ svādhī́bhirvacasyúbhiḥ* 'They made Agni to grow with ghee, with praises well thought and eloquent'; cf. Renou 1964b:28.

From the abstract *vacasyā́-* the instrumental *vacasyáyā* occurs twice in the Rigveda. 4.36.6 describes the attributes of him whom the Ṛbhu have promoted; he is, among other things, *ŕṣirvacasyáyā* (6a) 'a seer by virtue of his eloquence.' In 10.113.8ab the poet says: *víśve devā́so ádha vŕṣṇyāṇi té'vardhantsómavatyā vacasyáyā* 'All the gods made grow your (Indra's) virile powers with eloquence (i.e. chants) possessed of Soma'; cf. 5.14.6, cited above. The form *vacasyā́* occurs in three passages, of which two are considered here. In 2.10.6cd the poet says, ... *agníṃ juhvā vacasyā́ ... johavīmi* 'I call to Agni with my tongue, with eloquence (i.e. with eloquent tongue)'; on *juhū́* cf. the reference in fn. 10. In 6.49.8 the poet intends to praise Pūṣan with eloquence (*vacasyā́*).[22] On the third occurrence of *vacasyā́* see § 2.1.

1.2c. Little need be said of *brahmaṇyá-,* which is equivalent to *bráhman-* construed with *kṛ* (4.16.20b) etc. (see § 1.2b), as in 4.24.2cd: *sá yā́mannā́ maghávā mártyāya brahmaṇyaté súṣvaye várivo dhāt* 'He (Indra) makes wide space on the path, he the bountiful, for the man who fashions formulas, who presses Soma.' With *brahmaṇyaté súṣvaye* compare *vacasyáve ... sunvaté* in 1.51.13 (§ 1.2b). On *brahmaṇyā́* see § 2 end.

1.2d. A noun **daśas-* 'marque (concrète) d'honneur' (Renou 1961a:51) is posited to account for *daśasyá-* 'do honor to, render proper treatment to', which behaves syntactically like *dāś* 'render honorable treatment to' in governing both a dative and an accusative in construction with it (cf. Renou 1964b:89). 7.100.4ab says of Viṣṇu: *ví cakrame pṛthivī́meṣá etā́ṃ kṣétrāya ... mánuṣe* *daśasyán* 'He traversed the earth rendering proper treatment to Manu, in order that he have fields.' A hymn by the same seer, 7.99.3, says: *írāvatī dhenumátī hí bhūtáṃ suyavasínī mánuṣe daśasyā́/ vyastabhnā ródasī viṣṇo* ... '(Saying), "Do you (heaven and earth) be full of nourishment, of cows, of pastures ..." did you, Viṣṇu, prop apart the two world halves.'[23] The contents of the two passages are obviously related. Hence it would seem best to take *mánuṣe daśasyā́* as giving the same sense as *mánuṣe daśasyán*. The former sequence then uses the instrumental to express the reason (*hetu*) for Viṣṇu's act[24] and for thus addressing heaven and earth: 'by reason of rendering proper treatment to Manu', 'in order that I (Viṣṇu) render proper treatment to Manu'.[25]

1.2e. Examples have already been cited of *várivas-* construed with *kṛ, dhā* meaning 'make open space' and the equivalent denominative *varivasyá-;* see § § 1.1a (7.27.5, 8.46.10), 1.2c (4.24.2).[26] The abstract *varivasyā́* involves a possible ambiguity in interpretation in the one passage where it occurs, 1.181.9c: *huvé yádvāṃ varivasyā́ gṛṇānáḥ* ... 'When I call you two (Aśvin), chanting ...' The context makes it clear that the chanter calls to the Aśvin in order that they grant him rewards. The question is whether *varivasyā́ gṛṇānáḥ* means 'chanting in (my) quest of open space' or 'chanting with the purpose of (your) granting open space'. In the first case, *varivasyā́* would derive from a verb stem *varivasyá-* 'desire open space' (type § 1.1), in the second case from the denominative meaning 'make open space'. From the use of *varivasyá-* illustrated, the second alternative is preferable. However, one could support the first interpretation with the evidence of homophonous denominatives in *-yá-* belonging both to type § 1.1 and § 1.2; cf. fns. 5, 15 and § 1.3b.

A similar question arises with respect to *varasyā́,* though in this case a verb stem *varasyá-* does not occur in the Rigveda. In 6.62.2c the poet addresses the Aśvin: *purū́ várāṃsyámitā mímānāpó dhánvānyáti yātho ájrān* 'You traverse waters, deserts, level fields, measuring out immeasurable spaces.' As indicated in the translation, *várāṃsi* in this verse should mean 'spaces' in view of 6.62.1d *urū́ várāṃsi* 'wide spaces.' Hence it is licit to posit a denominative *varasyá-* 'make, grant, or desire open space'. In 6.49.11ab, the Marut are addressed: *ā́* ... *gantá gṛṇató varasyā́m.* As noted by Renou 1958a:83, who interprets here 'désir ... d'espace = de succès', *gṛṇató varasyā́m* is to be interpreted in conjunction with the phrase *varivasyā́ gṛṇānáḥ* of 1.181.9 (above). This renders probable an interpretation 'come to those who chant ...' taking *gṛṇatáḥ* as an accusative plural complement of *ā́* ... *gantá;* cf. Grassman 398, and 1.100.17b, where *rā́dhas* 'gift' is the complement of *abhí gṛṇanti* 'they chant'.[27] This does not tell us, however, whether *gṛnató varasyā́m* means 'chanting (your) granting of space' or 'chanting (their) desire for space', though again, in view of what has been said about *varivasyá-* the former may be preferred. The same possibilities obtain for 5.73.2cd, where *varasyā́* occurs: *varasyā́ yāmyádhrigū huvé taviṣṭamā bhujé* 'I go to the uncheckable (Aśvin) because they grant open space; I call the most powerful (Aśvin) for enjoyment.'

1.2f. It is well known that to the Vedic poets danger was oppression, *angustiae (áṃhas-, aṃhú-, aṃhatí-)*; to be saved from it was to be granted wide space. Thus in 1.63.7d the poet says, 'You (Indra) made oppression open space for Pūru' (*áṃho ... várivaḥ pū́rave kaḥ*). 'Make open space, freedom' is expressed by *várivas kṛ*, as in the verse just cited (cf. § 1.2e) and *urú kṛ*, as in 8.75.11c: *úrukṛdurú ṇaskṛdhi* 'Maker of wide space, do you make wide space for us.' The denominative verb equivalent to *urú kṛ* is *uruṣyá-*; 2.26.4cd; *uruṣyátīmáṃhaso ... aṃhóścidasmā urucákrir ...* 'He (Brahmaṇaspati) saves him (who does sacrifice to him, cf. § 1.3c) from oppression, for him does he make open space even of oppression.' The abstract *uruṣyā́-* occurs in 6.44.7d: *uruṣyā́ pāyúrabhavatsákhibhyaḥ* 'With his protection was he (Indra) a protector to his friends.' The semantic connection between *urú-* and *várivas-* is clear and may explain the formation of the denominative *uruṣyá-* (instead of **urūyá-*); cf. Renou 1961b:105.

1.3a. From the noun *ápas-* 'work' is derived *apasyá-* (1.121.7a: *apasyā́t*), equivalent to *ápas kṛ* 'perform work' (6.23.5b), whence also *apasyú-* 'active' and *apasyā́-* 'activeness'. There is also a compound *svápas-* meaning 'goodwork', that is, 'one who performs deeds well'. And from this comes a denominative *svapasyá-* 'behave as, be a performer of good work.'[28] 10.11.6cd says of Agni: *vívakti váhniḥ svapasyáte makhástaviṣyáte ásuro vépate matī́* 'The carrier (of oblations) announces (them), the generous one behaves as the artisan (of the sacrifice), the Asura exercises his force, trembles with thought (poem).'[29] The abstract *svapasyā́-* accordingly means 'being a performer of good work'; 4.35.2: *ā́gannṛbhūṇā́mihá ratnadhéyamábhūtsómasya súṣutasya pītíḥ/ sukṛtyáyā yátsvapasyáyā ca ékaṃ vicakra camasáṃ caturdhā́* 'The treasure gift of the Ṛbhu has come, the drinking of the well pressed Soma is at hand, since you (Ṛbhu) have, by your artisanship, by virtue of being skilled workers, divided the single cup into four.' Similarly, 4.35.9, where *svapasyā́* is used: *yáttṛtī́yaṃ sávanaṃ ratnadhéyamákṛṇudhvaṃ svapasyā́ suhastāḥ/ tádṛbhavaḥ páriṣiktaṃ va etát ... pibadhvam* 'That third pressing, skillful handed Ṛbhu, which you made a treasure gift by virtue of being skillful workers, is poured round for you; drink.' In view of the semantics, whereby *svapasyā́-* is derivable equally well directly from the compound *svápas-* as from the verbal *svapasyá-,* we must consider that to the Vedic poets *svapasyā́-* could bear that relation to *svápas-* that *kā́vya-* 'the property of a poet-seer' had to *kaví-* 'poet-seer'. Thus in 4.35.4b, again of the Ṛbhu, it is said: *yáṃ kā́vyena catúro vicakrá* '(The cup) which by your *kā́vya* you made four.' And 3.3.11b says of Agni that he is a *kaví* by virtue of his *svapasyā́* (*svapasyáyā kavíḥ*).[30]

The possibility that *svapasyā́-* derive directly from *svápas-* is noteworthy because of *sukṛtyā́* in 4.35.2, cited above. *Sukṛtyā́-* 'artisanship' is directly derivable from *sukṛ́t-* 'working skillfully' in addition to being derivable by way of an intermediate **sukṛtyá-*. 3.60.3, where it is said of the Ṛbhu that they 'attained Indra's friendship' (*índrasya sakhyámṛbhávaḥ sámānaśur*), calls them *sukṛ́taḥ sukṛtyáyā* 'artisans by their artisanship'. 4.35.7 speaks of the Ṛbhu as 'those whom, Indra, you made your friends because of their artisanship' (*sákhīṃyā́ṃ̐ indra cakṛṣé sukṛtyā́*).[31]

1.3b. From *krátu-* 'capability'[32] is derived *sukrátu-* 'of eminent capability'. The denominative *sukratūyá-* then means 'behave as one of eminent capability', as in 10.122.6d, which says of Agni: 'making the tour of the sacrifice, you act as the capable (poet you are)' (*vartírya-*

jñáṃ pariyántsukratūyase). In 10.122.6b, Agni is addressed as *sukrátu-* (*sukrato*), who milks easily milked cows for the benefit of the sacrificer devoted to the sacrifice. With reference to the sacrifice, Agni is the *hotṛ* who 'should perform the sacrifice, knowing all (poetic) secrets' (6.15.10c: *sá yakṣadvíśvā vayúnāni vidvā́n*), which is equivalent to his 'knowing all poetic capacities' (3.1.17b, 18d: *víśvāni kā́vyāni vidvā́n*); cf. also 10.122.2b: *víśvāni vidvā́nvayúnāni sukrato* 'knowing all secrets, you *sukratu*.'[33]

Like *svapasyā́-* and *sukṛtyā́-* (§ 1.3a), the abstract *sukratūyā́-* 'the property of one who is (acts as) one possessed of eminent capability' is, in the present context, derivable directly from *sukrátu-*. In this context *sukratūyā́-* is also used practically as a synonym of *kā́vya-*. Thus 1.160.4c: *ví yó mamé rájasī sukratūyáyā* '(Agni) who measured apart the two spaces by his *sukratūyā́-*.' 1.67.5ab says, again of Agni, *dādhā́ra pṛthivī́ṃ tasthámbha dyā́ṃ mántrebhiḥ satyaíḥ* 'He made firm the earth, propped up the heaven, with true *mantras*'; and 9.70.2b says of Soma: *ubhé dyā́vā kā́vyena ví śaśrathe* 'He separated heaven and earth by his poetic capability.' The form *sukratūyā́* occurs in 1.31.3: *tvámagne ... āvírbhava sukratūyā́ vivásvate* 'With your eminent capability, Agni, appear to Vivasvat.'

The denominative *kratūyá-* occurs twice in the Rigveda. 10.64.2a has the phrase *kratūyánti krátavaḥ*. The hymn begins with the poet asking which god's name he should magnify, which god will bring satisfaction, be of aid. In such a context of ritual poeticism, *kratūyánti krátavaḥ* is most easily interpreted to mean 'My poetic powers act as poetic powers', that is, 'my poetic powers exert themselves', and the phrase is on a par with the accompanying phrase (10.64.2b) *vénanti venā́ḥ* 'the visions see' (cf. Renou 1958a:118, Gonda 1963:183). The context of *kratūyá-* in 4.24.4 is slightly different. Though the hymn also begins with a question (1ab: *kā́ suṣṭutíḥ ... índram ... rā́dhasa ā́ vavartat* 'what praise will attract Indra to gift-giving?'), 3ab describes how, 'men in the encounter call to Indra from all sides': *táminnáro ví hvayante samīké.* Verse 4 continues: *kratūyánti kṣitáyo yóga ... árṇasātau/ sáṃ yádviśo'vavṛtranta ... ā́dinnéma indrayante ...* 'The settlements ... in the encounter, in the battle for winning water; when the clans come together, some seek after Indra.' Geldner renders *kratūyánti kṣitáyo yóge* as 'Die Völker sinnen auf Kriegesfahrt', Renou (1958a:118) as 'les populations préparent leurs pensées pour la guerre.' But in a similar context (cf. 7.32.23cd, § 1.1a), 7.32.26a has *índra krátuṃ na ā́ bhara* 'Indra, bring us capability.' *kratūyánti kṣitáyaḥ* in 4.24.4 can then mean 'the settlements seek the capability (which Indra can grant them)', so that *kratūyá-* here is of the type § 1.1 (cf. *sugātuyā́-* and *gātuyá-*, fn. 9).

1.3c. The hapax *vedhasyā́* occurs in 9.82.2a: *kavírvedhasyā́ páryeṣi mā́hinam.* If for *vedhás-* we accept the meaning 'orderer' (of the sacrifice, see Thieme 1949:46 fn.2, Renou 1960:10), *vedhasyā́* is interpreted as of the type *sukṛtyā́* (§ 1.3a): 'Poet seer, as orderer, you go about the great (filter).' *Vedhás-* is juxtaposed with *kaví-* in referring to Agni in 5.15.1a.

1.3d. *Sraddhā́manas-* 'faith-spirited' refers in 2.26.3 (cf. § 1.2f) to the sacrificer 'who seeks to gain with oblation the father of the gods, Brahmaṇaspati' (*devā́nāṃ yáḥ pitáramāvívāsati śraddhā́manā haviṣā́ bráhmaṇaspátim*). The derivative *śraddhāmanasyā́-* (cf. § 1.3a) 'faith-spiritedness' occurs in the form *-yā́* in 10.113.9cd: *índro dhúniṃ* *ca cúmuriṃ ca dambháyañcchraddhāmanasyā́ śṛṇute dabhī́taye* 'Indra is renowned for besting Dhuni and Cumuri for Dabhīti, because of his (Dabhīti's) faith-spiritedness.' As Geldner notes (ad 10.113.9d), a comparable passage is 6.26.6ab: *tváṃ śraddhā́bhirmandasānáḥ sómair dabhī́taye cúmurimindra siṣvap* 'You, Indra, set Cumuri to sleep for Dabhīti, because of his faith, you, intoxicated with Soma (and rejoicing in Dabhīti's faith).'[34]

The denominative *manasyá-* 'set one's mind to, intend' is equivalent to *mánas kṛ*.[35] For example, 1.54.9d: *máno vasudéyāya kṛṣva* '(Indra) set your mind to the treasure gift'; 10.27.5ab: *ná vā́ u mā́ṃ vṛjáne vārayante ná párvatāso yádaháṃ manasyé* 'Nor do any hem me in enclosures, not mountains, when I (Indra) set my mind to something'; 8.81.3: *nahí tvā ... dévā ná mártāso dítsantam ... vārayante* 'Neither gods nor men hold you in when you wish to give.'

1.4. There is a small group of *-yā́* forms which take part in a system such as that described above, but with one noteworthy difference: from the Indic point of view (cf. fn. 40), the *-yá-* verbs of this group are not directly classifiable as denominatives.

1.4a. From *irasyá-* 'wish ill, bear a grudge'[36] the derived abstract is *irasyā́-*; 5.40.7ab: *mā́ mā́mimáṃ táva sántamatra irasyā́ drugdhó bhiyásā ní gārīt* '(Atri,) let him (Svarbhānu) not swallow me (the sun), who am yours, he the false one, out of hate or fear.'

1.4b. Beside the nomen agentis *vipanyú-* (ultimately from the root *pan*) 'panegyrist' (used of the inspired chanter, *vípra-*, cf. Renou 1964b:86) there is an abstract *vipanyā́-* 'praise'. 10.72.1ab: *devā́nāṃ nú vayáṃ jā́nā prá* *vocāma vipanyáyā* 'We now proclaim the births of the gods with (hymns of) praise'; cf. 8.32.1: *prá kṛtā́ni ... índrasya gā́thayā/ ... vocata* 'Proclaim the deeds of Indra in chant', where *prá ... gā́thayā ... vocata* is exactly parallel to *prá vocāma vipanyáyā.* The form *vipanyā́* occurs in a difficult passage, 4.1.12ab: *prá śárdha ārta prathamáṃ vipanyā́ṃ ṛtásya yónā vṛṣabhásya nīḷé* 'First came forth the host (of ...), with praise, at the womb of truth, the nest of the bull.' On the passage, see Oldenberg 1909a:ad loc., Geldner ('unter lautem Beifall'), Lüders 590 ('unter Lob'), Renou 1964b:2 ('parmi l'acclamation'), 86 ('avec un péan').[37]

1.4c. Ultimately from the root *yaj* is the nominal *devayajyā́-* 'sacrificing to the gods'; e.g. 1.114.3a: *aśyā́ma te sumatíṃ devayajyáyā* 'We would gain your favor by sacrificing to the gods.' On the form *devayajyā́,* see § 2.1 and fn. 43.

1.4d. *Iṣudhyati* is given in the Nighaṇṭu (3.19) as a verb meaning 'pray, request' (*yācñākarman-*). This general meaning fits in the passages where the verb occurs. Of these, the otherwise difficult passage 8.69.2cd has the advantage of clearly showing the case form of a noun in construction with *iṣudhyá-*: *pátiṃ vo ághnyānāṃ dhenūnā́miṣudhyasi* 'You seek after the master of your unslayable cows.'[38] Like *īmahe* (see below), also given in Nighaṇṭu 3.19, *iṣudhyá-* then governs the accusative (*pátim*) of a noun in construction with it. This helps in the interpretation of the other passage where a finite form of *iṣudhyá-* occurs, 5.50.1: *víśvo devásya netúrmárto vurīta sakhyám/ víśvo rāyá iṣudhyati dyumnáṃ vṛṇīta puṣyáse.* Grassmann 227 glosses *iṣudhyá-* as '*ziehlen* nach, *streben* nach' and states that in this passage the verb occurs with a dative complement; Geldner also construes *iṣudhyati* with *rāyé* in this passage ('Jeder macht Anspruch auf Reichtum'), as does Renou (1959:30, 'Tout [mortel] a pour objectif la richesse'). But in accord with the syntax of 8.69.2, it seems better to interpret *sakhyá-* 'friendship' also as the object of *iṣudhyati:* 'Let every man choose the friendship of the god leader (Savitṛ);[39] every man asks after (that friendship) for (obtaining) wealth ...' The syntax then accords not only with 8.69.2 but also with the syntax of the semantically close *īmahe* 'we seek'; e.g. 5.24.4: *táṃ tvā ... sumnā́ya ... īmahe* 'We seek you (Agni) for happiness'; 8.18.20cd: *mitrámīmahe váruṇaṃ svastáye* 'We seek Mitra, Varuṇa, for well-being.'

Iṣudhyā́ occurs in 1.122.1cd: *divó astoṣyásurasya vīraíriṣudhyéva marúto ródasyoḥ,* for which varied interpretations have been given. One basic point of disagreement is that some interpret *iṣudhyā́* as a first person singular subjunctive (Geldner, 'indem ich gleichsam auf Himmel und Erde Anspruch nehme', Renou 1958a:26, 'comme si je prétendais ... [à l'empire] sur les Deux Mondes', 1959:6, 'comme si je voulais revendiquer ...'), while others (see Oldenberg 1909a:123) take it as an instrumental singular. Still others (Grassmann 227) take it to be a nominative singular. We may note that, since the passage is pretty clearly elliptic, we can compare 1.168.1: *ā́ vo ... suvitā́ya ródasyor ... vavṛtyām* 'I would attract you (the Marut) for the well-being of the two worlds.' 1.122.1cd is then possibly rendered: 'I have praised (Rudra) with the heroes of the Asura of heaven (i.e. Rudra), as with a prayer for the well-being of the two worlds (I praise) the Marut.'[40]

2. There are interesting syntactic questions associated with *-yā́* forms. AV 7.55.1 has the phrase *sumnayā́ dhehi no* ... 'Set us in the pleasant.' With *dhā* 'place' a locative is expected; 5.43.15d: *mā́ no ... durmataú dhāt* 'May (earth) not set us in evil thought'; or a dative, as in 5.41.16d (= 7.34.17a): *mā́ no riṣé dhāt* 'May he not deliver us to harm.' But an instrumental *sumnayā́* is strange. Sāyaṇa interprets the form as a locative (*saptamī*) with suffix *-yā́* (cf. fn. 46), glossing *sukhe sthāpaya* 'set in the pleasant'; and Whitney-Lanman ad loc. state: 'The construction ... is rendered as if it were for *-yāú*, from *-yú*.' Though *sumnayú-* should be a nomen agentis or adjective and not an abstract, we do find in fact a locative of this stem (*sumnayaú*) in AV 3.17.1 (= RV 10.101.4, see § 1.1e) where other texts have *sumnayā́*. Both peculiarities noted could be attributed to improper diction on the part of the Atharvaveda. However, in the Rigveda also there are cases of the syntactic peculiarity seen in AV 7.55.1, and in these cases textual corruption can hardly be claimed.

5.32.12cd says: *kíṃ te brahmā́ṇo gṛhate sákhāyo ye tvāyā́ nidadhúḥ kā́mamindra* 'Why do your formula chanters, your friends, Indra, complain, they who have placed their desire in you?'[41] Parallel to *pāda* d and with the expected syntax are: 7.32.2cd: *índre kā́maṃ jaritā́ro vasūyávo ... ā́ dadhuḥ* 'The chanters seeking treasure placed their desire in Indra'; 10.43.2b: *tvé ítkā́mam ... śiśraya* 'In you (Indra) have I lain my desire.' Nothing can alter the fact that in 5.32.12 *tvāyā́* is syntactically unexpected if it is interpreted as the instrumental of *tvāyā́-* (§ 1.1f). On the other hand, the syntax would be normal if *tvāyā́* in this passage were considered to function as a locative of the second person pronoun.

Similar to 5.32.12 in its use of *tvāyā́* is 7.29.3cd: *víśvā matī́rā́ tatane tvāyā́dhā me indra śṛṇavo hávemā́* 'I have extended all my thoughts (hymns) to you; hear then, Indra, these my calls.' *ā́ tan* is commonly construed with a locative, as in 10.80.4c: *agnírdiví havyámā́ tatāna* 'Agni extended the oblation to heaven'; 3.53.15cd: *ā́ sū́ryasya duhitā́ tatāna śrávo devéṣvamṛ́tamajūryám* 'To the gods did the daughter of the sun extend undying, everlasting fame.'

It is not difficult to justify how the Vedic poets used *tvāyā́* as a locative, and we may briefly sketch here the relations among pertinent passages. The normal instrumental of *tvad-* is of course *tváyā,* as in 4.4.14ab: *tváyā vayám ... tvótāstávapráṇītyaśyāma vā́jān* 'With you (Agni), helped by you, with your guidance, may we gain prizes.' With this passage, compare 6.1.13: *purū́ṇyagne ... tvāyā́ vásūni ... vasútā te aśyām/ purū́ṇi hi tvé ... sántyagne vásu* 'Agni, many treasures would I attain through my quest of you (or: in you, see below), by your capacity as a Treasure (*vasútā,* see § 2.2); for, many are the treasures in you, you Treasure.' To this passage in turn we may compare 7.18.1: *tvé ha yátpitáraścinna indra víśvā vāmā́ jaritā́ro ásanvan/ tvé gā́vaḥ sudúgdhāstvé hyáśvāstváṃ vásu devayaté vániṣṭhaḥ* 'In you it was that even our fathers, chanters, obtained all desirable (treasures), Indra; in you are easily milked cows, in you horses; you are the supreme winner of wealth for him who seeks after the gods.' We have then the following scheme:

(a) *tváyā ... tvótāḥ ... aśyāma vā́jān:* 4.4.14
(b) *tvāyā́ ... vásūni ... aśyām*
    tvé ... sánti ... vásu: 6.1.13

(c) *tvé ... vāmā́ ... ásanvan*
tvé ... gā́vaḥ ...: 7.18.1

The usages exemplified in this scheme clearly support the use of *tvāyā́* as an equivalent of the locative *tvé*. Once we accept that *tvāyā́* is sometimes used as a locative, however, we can no longer analyze *tvāyā́* in this function as from *tvāyā́-*. Neither, however, can we directly classify *tvāyā́* as a formal locative. Though the use in (b) compared with (c) supports the interpretation of *tvāyā́* as a locative in function, the same form *tvāyā́* in (b) can be compared to the unambiguous instrumental *tváyā* in (a). Further, *tvāyā́* occurs in passages where, on the basis of parallel texts, it is interpretable as having the function of a dative (§ 2.2).[42]

There is a well-known suffix *-yā́* which is freely added to nominal stems. This is the so-called adverbial *-yā́* of Indo-Iranian date; e.g. *āśuyā́* 'rapidly' (Av. *āsuyā*) from *āśú-* 'rapid', *dhṛṣṇuyā́* 'boldly' from *dhṛṣṇú-* 'daring', *svapnayā́* (AV 5.7.8) 'in dreams' from *svápna-* 'sleep, dream'. This suffix probably originated in pronominal forms such as *ayā́* 'thus'; see J. Schmidt 212-4 fn. and Wackernagel-Debrunner: 77.[43]

There is clear evidence of contact between *-yā́* forms of the *-yā́-* abstracts within the system described in §§ 1-1.4 and homophonous forms with suffix *-yā́*. The denominative *ṛjūyá-* from *ṛjú* 'straight' is of the type § 1.3 and means 'behave honestly, correctly'. E.g. 1.136.5ad: *yó mitrā́ya váruṇāyā́vidhajjáno ... táṃ pári pāto áṃhaso .../ támaryamā́bhi rakṣatyṛjūyántamánu vratám* 'The man who rendered their part to Mitra, Varuṇa, do they protect from oppression; (who) behaves properly, according to his vow, him does Aryaman protect' (cf. H.-P. Schmidt 71). The abstract derived from *ṛjūyá-* should be *ṛjūyā́-* 'correct behavior'. However, the form *ṛjūyā́* which does occur does not have this meaning; it means simply 'straight' (adv.); 1.183.5: *yuvā́ṃ gótamaḥ ... hávaté'vase .../ díśaṃ ná diṣṭā́mṛjūyéva yántā́ me hávaṃ nāsatyópa yātam* 'To you does Gotama call for help; come, Nāsatya, to my call, as straight to a direction indicated.' The use of *ṛjūyā́* here clearly indicates an analysis *ṛjū-yā́,* a *-yā́* form derived from *ṛjú-* but with the lengthened vowel typical of the verb *ṛjūyá-* and also expected in the abstract derived from this verb. Similarly, the verb *ṛtāyá-* derived from *ṛtá-* means 'speak truth'.[44] But the form *ṛtayā́* which occurs is ambiguous; 2.11.12b: *dhíyaṃ vanema ṛtayā́ sápantaḥ* 'May we win poetic thought, nurturing it *ṛtayā́.*' Here *ṛtayā́* could be interpreted to mean 'by the speaking of truth' (< abstract *ṛtayā́-*) or simply 'with truth' (< *ṛtá-*). Gonda 1963:111 with fn. 6 takes *ṛtayā́* to be an 'Instrumental of procedure' and translates, 'with *ṛta*', while Lüders 446 speaks of, 'Das Adverb *ṛtayā́*' and renders, '(mit) Wahrheit pflegend'.

2.1. We are thus required to recognize: that there was contact between *-yā́* instrumental forms of abstracts in *-yā́-* and forms in *-yā́* derived from nouns which served as bases for denominative verbs, whence were derived abstracts; and also that *-yā́* forms homophonous with *-yā́-* abstract instrumentals were used as adverbs and locatives (*tvāyā́,* § 2). The use of *tvāyā́* as a locative is paralleled by the similar usage of the formal instrumentals *jmā́, kṣamā́* 'on earth'. The former occurs in 6.52.15a (*yé ké ca jmā́ mahíno* ... 'Whichever (gods) are great on earth ...') and functions like the formal locative *sadhásthe* 'in the seat (of the waters)' used in verse 15b of the same hymn. An example of *kṣamā́* functioning as a locative occurs in 5.52.3cd (*marútāmadhā máho diví kṣamā́ ca manmahe* 'We commemorate the greatness of the Marut in heaven and on earth'), where *kṣamā́* is coordinated with the formal locative *diví* 'in heaven'. *Kṣámi* occurs eight times in the Rigveda, seven times in the sequence *adhí kṣámi* 'on earth'. *Kṣámi* without preposition occurs in 8.60.7ab: *yáthā ... atasámagne saṃjū́rvasi kṣámi* 'As, Agni, you consume a bush on the ground.' The vocalism of *kṣamā́,* opposed to that of *jmā́,* is explainable as due to influence of the locative *kṣámi,* where the full grade is in order (see Wackernagel-Debrunner 243).

The *-yā́* of *tvāyā́* is, then, descriptively, like the *-ā́* of *kṣamā́,* to be classed as an instrumental suffix sharing with other instrumentals adverbial and locative functions (cf. § 2.3). In the present context it is not crucial to consider whether formal instrumentals functioning locatively were originally restricted to contexts including verbs denoting movement (cf. Delbrück 128-9).

It is then possible that other forms discussed thus far can also be interpreted in more than one way. In 6.21.1, after calling to Indra, the poet says (1d): *rayír ... īyate vacasyā́* 'wealth is sought ...' Of course *vacasyā́* can mean 'with eloquence' (see § 1.2b; Geldner: 'mit Beredsamkeit'). But after the above discussion (§ 2), we must also consider passages such as 1.36.1c: *agníṃ sūktébhirvácobhirīmahe* 'We seek Agni with well-spoken words (of hymns)'; 3.37.3ab: *nā́māni te ... víśvābhirgīrbhírīmahe* 'We seek your names with all our hymns.' Hence, *vacasyā́* can be analyzed also as *vacas-yā́* equivalent to *vácasā* or *vácobhiḥ:* cf. Sāyaṇa who glosses *vacasyā́* in 6.21.1 by *stutyā* 'with praise'. As far as *vacasyā́* is concerned, we must also note that the accusative of the abstract, *vacasyā́m* must itself have been considered by the Vedic poets to mean simply 'hymn' or such. 2.35.1a: *úpemasṛkṣi vājayúrvacasyām* 'In quest of prizes have I loosed this hymn'; cf., for example, 7.18.4b: *úpa bráhmāṇi sasṛje vásiṣṭhaḥ* 'Vasiṣṭha loosed the formulas'.[45]

Another form which, in view of the present discussion, is to be considered ambiguous, is *brahmaṇyā́*, 8.6.33: *utá brahmaṇyā́ vayáṃ túbhyaṃ ... / víprā atakṣma jīváse*. We can, with Oldenberg 1912:ad loc., interpret *brahmaṇyā́* as from the abstract derived from *brahmaṇyá-* (§ 1.2c): 'And, (Indra,) through our using (fashioning) formulas, have we ... fashioned for you (a hymn, *matím* of verse 32, cf. Oldenberg, loc. cit.), that we might live.' On the other hand, *brahmaṇyā́* can now also be interpreted as a *-yā́* form from *bráhman-:* 'with formulas'. Still another suggestion is made by Gonda 1963:109 with fn. 159: *brahmaṇyā́* is the instrumental singular of the (otherwise not attested) *brahmaṇyá-* 'brahmanhood'. See also my fn. 28.

2.2. It is now necessary to consider that forms such as *varivasyā́* (§ 1.2e) also can be analyzed *varivas-yā́* with an instrumental suffix *-yā́* and that the form can mean 'for reason of open space', that is, 'that you grant open space'. For, as in the case of *ṛjūyā́, ṛtayā́* (§ 2), the fact that *varivasyā́* occurs within the system described in §§ 1-1.4 does not now preclude the second interpretation. An instrumental *varivasyā́* < *várivas-* then has the same function as instrumentals of the type *śruṣṭī́* 'for reason of attentive hearing', that is, 'that attentive hearing be granted', as in 6.68.1a: *śruṣṭī́ vāṃ yajñá údyataḥ* 'The sacrifice is extended to you (Indra and Varuṇa) that you lend it attentive hearing'; cf. Renou 1960:79. The sacrifice is supposed to be *śruṣṭimát-* 'possessed of attentive hearing (by the gods)'; 1.93.12d: *kṛṇutáṃ no adhavráṃ śruṣṭimántam* 'Make our sacrifice attentively heard.' By obtaining such an attention, the sacrificer gains the aid he desires of the gods; 1.178.1ab: *yáddha syā́ ta indra śruṣṭírásti yáyā babhū́tha jaritṝ́bhya ūtī́* 'If, Indra, the attentive hearing is yours (i.e. you grant it), whereby you were of aid to the chanters ...'

Instrumentals of the type *śruṣṭī́, ūtī́* 'for assistance' are interesting in that they commonly alternate with dative forms; e.g. 2.38.2ab: *viśvasya hí śruṣṭáye devá ūrdhváh prá bāhávā pṛthúpāṇiḥ sisarti* 'That all attend him, the god (Savitṛ), erect, broad-handed, spreads forth his arms (rays)' (cf. H.-P. Schmidt 81). In fact, such forms as *śruṣṭī́* and *ūtī́* have commonly been classed as datives (see Wackernagel-Debrunner: 149-50). There is no compelling reason for this classification. It has no support from Iranian, where *-i*-stems have instrumentals in *-ī* (Bartholomae §§ 218.3, 406 [pp. 124, 226], Wackernagel 1930:147); and it only complicates the morphology while obscuring the simple fact that in some contexts instrumental and dative singular forms alternate (see Wackernagel-Debrunner :149 [§ 74b]). The alternation type *śruṣṭī́/ śruṣṭáye* is of special interest because in some passages *-yā́* forms occur in contexts where parallel passages have dative forms.

In 2.18.6d (§ 1.1f) *tvāyā́ páriṣikto mádāya* occurs; this is paralleled by 9.11.8 *índrāya soma ... mádāya páriṣicyase* 'Soma, you are poured round for Indra's intoxication', where the dative *índrāya* is used. In 4.2.6 also (§ 1.1f), *tvāyā́* could be simply 'for you'. Thus also in 3.46.5ab: *yáṃ sómamindra pṛthivī́dyā́vā gárbhaṃ ná mātā́ bibhṛtástvāyā́* 'The Soma which, Indra, heaven and earth carry for you, like a mother a child.'

In 10.70.1d (fn. 43) *devayajyā́* occurs; 7.3.9cd, however, contains a dative: *ā́ yó ... jániṣṭa devayájyāya ...* '(Agni) who was born for sacrificing to the gods.' Geldner ('zur Gotterverehrung') and Renou 1965:47 ('pour le sacrifice aux dieux') translate 10.70.1d as though it contained a dative. It must also be noted that while for interpreting *devayajyá* in 10.70.1d as a locative one can cite the parallel passage 6.63.4 (fn. 43), the latter is in turn paralleled by 8.19.10a, which contains a dative: *yásya tvámūrdhvó adhvarā́ya tiṣṭhasi* 'For whose sacrifice you (Agni) are erect.'

2.3. The above discussion does not of course allow us to say directly that a form such as *devayajyá* is to be classed formally as either a locative or a dative. The use of forms like *tvāyá* and *devayajyá* in functions corresponding to those of formal locatives and datives and the use of a suffix *-yá* for deriving adverbs, as well as the possibility of interpreting *varivasyá* etc. as instrumentals of *várivas-* etc. (§2.2), are all accounted if, instead of speaking of an adverbial *-yá* we recognize such an INSTRUMENTAL suffix.[46] The use of an instrumental designating the cause of an activity (§ § 1.2e, 2.2) is indisputable. The use of *-yá* forms in contexts where elsewhere the dative is used (§ 2.2) is consonant with alternation of instrumental and dative forms as noted in § 2.2. Finally, the locative function of a form *tvāyá* is paralleled by the locative function of an instrumental such as *kṣamá* (§ 2.1), and the classification of all such *-yá* forms as instrumentals accords with the most probable original locus of *-yá* (§ 2).

There is another Vedic suffix with functions parallel to those of *-yá*, namely *-tā*. From *bāhú-* 'arm', for example, is derived *bāhútā* 'with (their) arms'; 1.41.2: *yáṃ bāhúteva píprati pā́nti mártyaṃ riṣáḥ/ áriṣṭaḥ sárva edhate* 'That mortal, whole and unharmed, thrives, whom (Mitra, Varuṇa, and Aryaman) transport as with their arms, protect from harm.' This suffix provides locatival forms also, as in 10.49.2a: ... *dhur* ... *devátā*, 7.85.3b: *devátā dhuḥ* 'they set among the gods' (cf. § 2). Equivalent to *devátā* is the locatival *devatrā́* 'among the gods'; for references see Grassmann 633-4.[47]

2.4. The forms *puruṣátā, puruṣatrā́,* and *puruṣatvátā* are especially interesting. In 3.33.8d *puruṣatrā́* has the value of a locative: *mā́ no ní kaḥ puruṣatrā́* 'Do not humble us among men.' In 7.75.8c the form *puruṣátā* has this value: *mā́ no barhíḥ puruṣátā nidé kar* 'Do not subject our *barhis* to scorn among men.' However, *puruṣatvátā* occurs in a passage where locatival value will not supply an appropriate meaning; 5.48.5cd: *ná tásya vidma puruṣatvátā vayáṃ yáto ... savitā́ dāti vā́ryam* 'We do not know ... whence ... Savitṛ grants the gift of choice.' As commentators have recognized *puruṣatvátā* gives the reason for not knowing and should mean 'by virtue of being human', 'as humans'. Similarly, 4.54.3ab: *ácittī yáccakṛmā́ daívye jáne dīnaírdákṣaiḥ ... puruṣatvátā* 'If (Savitṛ) we have committed (a wrong) toward the host of gods through thoughtlessness, because of our deficient capacities, as humans ...'; 7.57.4ab: *ŕ̥dhaksā́ vo maruto didyúdastu yádva ā́gaḥ puruṣátā kárāma* 'Marut, let your lightning be far from us, should we as humans transgress against you'; 10.15.6cd: *mā́ hiṃsiṣṭa pitaraḥ kénacinno yádva ā́gaḥ puruṣátā kárāma* 'Manes, do not harm us for any reason, should we as humans commit a wrong against you.'[48] The suffix *-tā* is thus added not only to an abstract *puruṣatva-* to yield a form meaning 'by virtue of humanity', but also to the nonabstract *púruṣa-* 'man' to yield a form meaning 'as men'.

It is possible that some *-yā́* forms occur of the type *puruṣátā* 'as men'.

From *vápus-* 'marvellous sight' (cf. Renou 1958a:75) is derived the denominative verb *vapuṣyá-* 'consider a marvel',[49] as in 3.1.4d: ... *devā́so agníṃ jánimanvapuṣyan*

'The gods viewed Agni as a marvel at his birth'. The abstract *vapuṣyá-* should mean 'considering of something a marvel', 'awe'. The form *vapuṣyā́* occurs in 1.183.2: *suvṛ́drátho vartate yánnabhí kṣā́m ... / vápurvapuṣyā́ sacatāmiyáṃ gī́r* ... 'The easily rolling chariot of the Aśvin turns as it goes to earth ...; let this hymn follow ... the marvel.' For *vapuṣyá-* Grassmann 1213 gives a gloss 'Bewunderung', and he lists *vapuṣyā́* as an instrumental of this stem. 'With awe' does not, however, seem appropriate. For, the chant itself is qualified as great (*mahī́*), mighty (*bṛhatī́*) as it goes out to the gods; 5.43.8ab: *ácchā mahī́ bṛhatī́ gī́rdūtó ná gantvaśvínā huvádhyai* 'Let this ... hymn go to the Aśvin, like a messenger, to call them.' In 1.183.2, then, it seems more in keeping with Vedic diction to interpret *pāda* c as 'Let this hymn, itself a marvel, accompany the marvel (of the chariot of the Aśvin).'[50] The analysis of *vapuṣyā́* as *vapuṣ-yā́* is further supported by the fact that the same poet uses the form *ṛjūyā́* (§ 2) in verse five of the same hymn.

The compound *suśrávas-* means 'much-renowned'. The form *suśravasyā́* occurs once in the Rigveda. If *suśravasyā́* is derived from *suśravasyá-**, denominative of *suśrávas-*, we should expect it to mean either 'seek great renown' (§ 1.1) or 'the property of being one of great renown' (§ 1.3). In his translation of 1.178.4ab, Geldner adopts the former: *evā́ nṛ́bhirindraḥ suśravasyā́ prakhādáḥ ... abhí mitríṇo bhūt* 'Also übertrifft Indra mit seinen Mannen im Drang nach Ruhm als ... (Feinde) vertilger alle, die Freundschaft halten.' It must be noted of course that the textual absence of *suśravasyá-* makes it impossible to decide on a certain interpretation. The interpretation 'by virtue of his being much renowned' would also be conjectural. Certain features of the present hymn, however, suggest a different interpretation. In 1.178.3ab the poet says: *jétā nṛ́bhiríndraḥ pṛtsú ... śrótā hávaṃ ... kāróḥ* 'Indra is a conqueror with heroes in battles ...; he hearkens to the call of the chanter.' Now, the epithet *suśrávastama-* applies to Indra, as in 1.131.7d: *śṛṇuṣvá suśrávastamaḥ* 'hearken (as one who is) *suśrávastama-*'; 3.45.5d: *bhávā naḥ suśrávastamaḥ* 'be our ...' The epithet is also used of Soma in 1.91.17c: *bhávā naḥ suśrávastamaḥ sákhā vṛdhé* 'Be our ... friend, that we may grow.' A comparison of 1.91.17c with 8.13.3c (to Indra) *bhávā naḥ sumné ántamaḥ sákhā vṛdhé* 'In happiness be our friend closest at hand ...', indicates that *suśrávastama-* is most easily interpreted as meaning 'best hearkening (to our call)'. Indra is also called *havanaśrút-* 'who hearkens to a call' (1.10.10b, 8.12.23b). The superlative *suśrávastama-* then derives from a compound *suśrávas-* 'who hearkens attentively', 'who listens well' (as in TB 1.2.1.6). It is then possible to take 1.178.4ab with verse 3ab of the same hymn and interpret the former as, 'Thus Indra, with heroes the destroyer (of enemies), as he who hearkens attentively, is at hand for those who hold to a pact.'[51] Again, the analysis of *suśravasyā́* as *suśravas-yā́* is supported by the consideration that 1.178 and 1.182 (see above) are by the same poet (Agastya).

In addition, it is possible to interpret *vedhasyā́* (§ 1.3c) to mean 'as orderer', parallel to *puruṣátā* 'as humans'. And similar interpretations would also be possible for *svapasyā́* (§ 1.3a) and *sukratūyā́* (§ 1.3b).[52] Indeed, as noted (§ 1.3a), even if *svapasyā́* is analyzed as the instrumental singular of the abstract *svapasyā́-*, the abstract itself is semantically derivable directly from the compound *svápas-*. The relation between *svapasyā́* (< *svapasyā́-*) 'by virtue of being *svápas*' and *svapasyā́* (< *svápas*) 'as *svápas*' is parallel to the relation between *puruṣatvátā* and *puruṣátā* (§ 2.3). That the functions of *-yā́* and *-tā* are exactly parallel (§ 2.3) and, as we shall note (§ 3), the use of *-tā* in functions identical with those of *-yā́* is ascribable to influence of the latter suffix, lend additional support to the suggestion that from abstract instrumentals in *-yā́* was derived the use of *-yā́* to derive forms meaning 'as ...'

3. Wackernagel-Debrunner:116 (§ 59aβ) derives the *-yā́* instrumentals and also *-tā* forms of the type *devátā́* (§ 2.3) by haplology: *-yā́* < *-yáyā, -tā* < *-tātā*. This derivation is also given for *madhyā́* 'in the midst'. The same explanation of *madhyā́* appears in Wackernagel 1957a:279 (§ 241) and also in Wackernagel 1957b:21 (§ 6cγ), where *ubhayā́* 'in both ways' is likewise explained as < *ubhaya-yā*. The statements about *madhyā́* and *ubhayā́,* which are now generally accepted (cf. most recently Szemerényi 1966:4, who mistakenly calls *madhyā́* one of the 'Instrumentals in *-yā,* reduced from *-(ya)yā* ...') are interesting in that they narrow down the possible derivations so strictly, overlooking other obvious possibilities.

It is well known that some forms which function as adverbs are formally identical with instrumental singular forms except for their accentuation; e.g. *dívā* 'by day' (instr. sg. *divā́*), *dakṣiṇā́-* 'on the right' < *dákṣiṇa-* 'right'. In these forms there is no question of haplology. Now *madhyā́* is formally related to the adjective *mádhya-* 'middle' exactly as *dakṣiṇā́* is to *dákṣiṇa-*. Further, in the case of *ubhayā́* we should also reckon with a possible *ubha-yā́* < *ubhá-* 'both' in addition to derivation by haplology < *ubhaya-yā* from *ubháya-* 'of both kinds'. It is remarkable, then, that in the discussion of the type *dakṣiṇā́* Wackernagel (1957b:21) states outrightly: '*ubhayā́* "in beiderlei Weise" u. *madhyā́* "dazwischen" gehören nicht hierher, weil sie das Adverbialsuffix *-yā́* enthalten.' This account must be considered incomplete. This is not to deny that one possible origin of *madhyā́* is a haplologized *madhya-yā́*. I do reject, however, taking this to be the ONLY possible derivation. For, it is not possible to decide synchronically whether *madhyā́* is of the type *dakṣiṇā́* or of the type *ṛtayā́* (§ 2), *naktayā́* 'at night'. Given this, we should seek to find out whether the type *dakṣiṇā́* could have exerted any influence on forms such as *madh(ya)yā* which could have contributed to the total ousting of the nonhaplologized form. Such influence must be considered for *savyā́* 'on the left', obviously semantically relatable to *dakṣiṇā́,* as in the only Rigvedic passage where it occurs, 2.27.11: *ná dakṣiṇā́ ... ná savyā́ ... ná prācī́nam ... ná paścā́* 'not to the right ... not on the left ... nor in front ... nor in back' (cf. my fn. 55).

If accounting for *madhyā́* etc. exclusively by haplology is suspect, we should consider the exclusively haplological explanation of *-yā́* and *-tā* forms equally open to doubt. For, soon after the discussion of these forms, Wackernagel (1930:119 [§ 60.aα]) says that the genitive and ablative forms in *-yāyāḥ* and locative forms in *-yāyām* (see Lanman 359-60) were not haplologized because 'die Silben etwas weniger gleich waren.' This is unacceptable as an explanation, since it is common knowledge that in known cases of haplology the general conditioning factor is the contiguity of syllables containing the same consonant, not absolute identity of contiguous syllables, which in any case would not apply to *-yā́* < *-yáyā*.

Now the conditions for haplology in *-yā́*-stems obtained in the instrumental singular (*-yáyā*), dative singular (*-yā́yai*), genitive-ablative singular (*-yā́yāḥ*), and locative singular (*-yā́yām*). That haplology could occur in such forms is shown by the dative singular *svatpatyaí* (1.54.11d) <*svapatyā́-* 'possessed of good offspring'.[53] Similarly, for *-tāt*-stems the conditions for haplology obtained throughout most of the paradigm; e.g. *sarvátātā* (instr. sg.) 'completely', *devátātā* 'as a god, among the gods', *devátāte* (dat. sg.) 'for the gods',[54] *vṛkátāti* (loc. sg.) 'among wolves'. The question now is what conditions account for the fact that in the *-yā-* and *-tāt-* stems haplologized forms gained predominance only in the instrumental singular. These conditions are implied in the discussion of § § 1 and 2. The majority of *-yā́* forms in question occur within the system of *-yá*-denominatives.[55] The expected abstract noun in this system is a *-yā́*-stem, whence a haplologized instrumental singular in *-(yá)yā*. Judging from the predominance of nonhaplologized forms elsewhere in the paradigms of *-yā́*-stems, these haplologized forms must have been in competition with nonhaplologized forms; and this, in addition to possible reformation of regular paradigmatic forms, accounts for the coexistence of both forms, as in *vacasyáyā, vacasyā́* (see Appendix). However, from the base noun of *-yá-* denominatives could be derived forms of the type *ṛjūyā́, ṛtayā́* (§ 2). Given the many possibilities for interaction among the denominative types discussed in § § 1-1.4 (cf. § § 1.3a-c and fns. 5, 7, 9, 15) as well as the discussion in § § 2-2.4, we must consider that throughout the *-yá-* derivative system not only could a *-yā́*-abstract be formed but also a form with the instrumental-adverbial suffix *-yā́* derived directly from the base noun. Briefly, *-yā́* forms resulting from haplology of *-yáyā* coincided with *-yā́* forms containing the suffix *-yā́,* thus buttressing the haplologized forms.[56]

The use of forms derived by suffixing *-yā́* directly to the base of a *-yá*-denominative also goes some way in accounting for the fact that within the system described in § § 1-1.4 *-yā́* forms would so commonly be the only forms attested in the Rigveda of the *-yā́*-abstract (see Appendix).

It would be rash, however, to insist too much on such statistics. From the verb *namasyá-* (cf. fn. 20), the abstract *namasyā́-* occurs once in the Rigveda, and then in the nominative plural (*namasyā́ḥ,* 10.104.7d). By the same token, however, we cannot say that the paucity of other paradigmatic forms of *-yā́*-stems (see Lanman 359-60) can count as positive evidence against saying that in these forms nonhaplologized types were favored. From *sūryā́-* 'Sūryā' the dative singular *sūryā́yai* occurs three times and the genitive-ablative singular *sūryā́yāḥ* occurs eight times (cf. fn. 55), while haplologized forms like *svapatyaí* do not occur from this stem in the Rigveda.

We must, as noted (§ 2.3), also recognize a suffix *-tā* with functions parallel to those of *-yā́.*[57] Since *-yā́* is plausibly accounted for as extracted from pronominal forms (see § 2) and no such explanation is available for *-tā,* the latter is most simply accounted for as extended from haplologized forms of the type *devátā,* an extension supported by an already existant *-yā́.*[58] Again, as for *-yā́* forms, the restriction of putative haplologized form of *-tāt*-stems to original instrumentals (*-tātā*) is explained by the interaction of haplologized *-(tā)tā* and forms with the suffix *-tā.*

It is therefore inaccurate to say that the types *gavyā́* (§ 1.1a) and *devátā* (§ 2.3) resulted UNIQUELY from haplology. Haplology is one of the origins. But the important factor in accounting for the distribution of such forms is the interaction between forms containing suffixes *-yā́* and *-tā* and homophonous forms resulting from haplologic shortening.

4. The above discussion is of interest for viewing haplology in Indo-European in general. Wackernagel 1957a: 279 (§ 241a) distinguishes two types of haplologic loss of the first of two successive syllables according to whether the pertinent sequence occurred across a morph boundary in derivation (§ 241aα: 'Innerhalb desselben Worts ...') or in composition (§ 241aβ: 'Im Ausgang des Vorderglieds eines Kompositums ...'). For example, *madh(ya)yá* as opposed to *śé(va)vṛdha-* 'precious'. Grammont 331 speaks of 'superposition syllabique' and states emphatically: 'Ce phénomène *ne se produit que dans la composition et la dérivation.*' Accepting this view, Debrunner 1957a:160 (ad Wackernagel 1957a:278,34) says: 'Dass die Haplologie nur in Wörten mit Ableitung und in Komposita vorkommt (Grammont), ist darin begründet, dass sie mindestens drei Silben voraussetzt.' Nevertheless, Wackernagel (loc. cit.) cites *svapatyaí* (see § 3) as a case of haplology, and Grammont (335.) quotes the Rigvedic third plural *vanta* (< *vananta, van* 'win').

With a view toward a more insightful classification, then, it is worthwhile to consider briefly the contexts for haplology in Indo-European. The major condition for haplologic shortening is of course the occurrence of a sequence *CVCV* (or *VCVC*) in which the consonants are identical. Such a sequence could occur in the following contexts:

(a) Across the boundary of separate syntactic units in a sentence: (1) The separate syntactic units together became a standard, frozen sequence. E.g.

Vedic infinitives in *-tavai* < **-tavai vāi,* a sequence of an inflected form (dative of a *-tu*-stem) and a particle. (2) Condition (1) except that the contiguous items do not form a standardized sequence. E.g. AV 13.2.9b: *ápāvṛktámo* ... 'He turned away the darkness', in which *ápāvṛktá-* < *ápāvṛktatá-*; see Wackernagel 1907. 9.98.3c: *dhā́rā yáḥ* ... 'who with the flow ...' < *dhā́rayāyáḥ;* cf. Wackernagel-Debrunner 1930:116 (§ 59aβ). In Greek, Hesiod, Aspis 253-4: *amphì mèn autôi/ báll'ónukhas* 'They (the Kêres) thrust their nails about him', where *báll'ónukhas* < *bállonónukhas* (see Schwyzer 1903). For numerous other examples, see Debrunner 1957a: 163 (ad Wackernagel 1957a:Nach 280,17).

(b) In a single syntactic unit: (1) In a compound or suffixal derivative. Hence, the conditions for haplology are present no matter what the larger context constituted by suffixing case endings to the compound or derivative. E.g. Skt. *śévṛdha-* (above); Gk. *kelainephḗs* 'black-cloud' (epithet of Zeus), 'dark' (blood, etc.) < **kelainone-*, *amphoreús* 'amphora' < *amphipho-*;[59] Lat. *nutrix* 'nurse, foster mother' < **nutritrix, voluntas* 'will' < **voluntitāt-*. (2) The conditions for haplology occur in certain forms of a paradigm, that is, when certain case markers follow the nominal base or verbal suffixes follow the verb stem. E.g. Skt. *svapatyaí, vanta* (see above), *kánikrat* 'bellowing' (9.63.20c) < *kánikradat* (cf. Wackernagel 1957a: 279 [§ 241aα]) ; Lat. *dixtī* (2sg.), *dixtis* (2pl.) 'said' < *dixistī, dixistis,* pf. subj. *dixe-* < *dixisse-,* pf. inf. *dixe* < *dixisse* (see Sommer 589-90, Leumann 335-6); OHG *unsera* (gen. sg. fem.), *unsero* (gen.

pl.), *iuero* (gen. pl.) < *unserer-*, *iuerer-*, forms of the possessive adjectives *unser-* 'our', *iuer-* 'your' (see Braune-Mitzka § 286 Anm. 3).[60]

The conditions of the pairs (a1), (b1) and (a2), (b2) are comparable in that in the first two the conditions for haplology are present regardless of the larger context in which may appear the sequences in question. For (a2), on the contrary, the conditions for haplology occur in what we may call an occasional collocation of syntactic items, and in (b2) these conditions obtain only in certain paradigmatic forms. Empirically also the results of (a1), (b1) on the one hand, and (a2), (b2) on the other, are distinct. Hesiod's *báll'* for the regular *bállon* is unique; AV *avṛk* for *avṛkta* (2x, RV) is unique; *kánikrat* occurs only once in the Rigveda, while *kánikradat* occurs over twenty times. But there is no attested nonhaplologized version of Lat. *nutrix* or Gk. *kelainephés*. Now, between (a1) and (a2) the difference is one of degree: (a1) stipulates a sequence which speakers came to use in a fixed order. This being so, we should posit the development in stages, so that at one stage both *-*tavai vāi* and haplologized -*tavāi* were in competitive use (cf. the infinitives in -*tave* and the particle *vaí*), while in a subsequent stage the haplologized sequence became the norm. If (a) and (b) are comparable, we should posit development in stages for (b). In the case of (b2) Indic supplies clear evidence for the coexistence of -*yáyā* and -*yā́* from -*yā́*- stems (see Appendix). It is then possible to consider Homeric *amphiphoreús* (see fn. 59) either a reformation of a previously haplologized form or simply an unhaplologized form. I do not think one can justifiably accept Grammont's statement (331) concerning Gk. *kelainephés*: 'Ce n'est pas une dissimilation, car, pour que l'on puisse dire, à proprement parler, qu'il y a eu dissimilation, il faut que la forme non dissimilée ait existée; **kelainonephḗs* n'a jamais existé; dès le moment où le mot a été crée il a eu la forme *kelainephḗs.*' As noted, however, in type (b1) the haplologized forms more commonly oust the unhaplologized forms than in type (b2). A reason for this is not hard to see. Not only are the conditions for haplology more constantly present in (b1), but the compounds and derivatives are separate lexical items. In (b2), on the contrary, we are dealing with stems, abstractions which serve to derive paradigmatic sets of syntactic forms (cf. Kurylowicz 160). Each of the interrelated members of a paradigm is apt to influence the others. A form like Lat. *dixit* (3sg.) 'said' could thus exert pressure for the retention (or reformation) of a second singular *dixisti,* and this in spite of the existence in other paradigms of forms of the type *amasti* 'loved'.

4.1. The Latin materials show that at no stage in the history of Latin did the haplologized type *dixti* gain complete predominance at the expense of full forms of the type *dixisti.* It is well known that the haplologized type is best attested in Old Latin and later in poetry (see Sommer 589-90, Leumann 335-6, Kent § 392 fn. 10). For our purposes it will suffice to rehearse some of the verbs which in Plautus and Terence occur in forms of the type *dixti, dixe-, dixe.* From *cedo* 'leave', Plautus has the second singular perfect *discesti* 'came away' (Asin. 251: *iam diu est factum, quom discesti ab ero atque abiisti ad forum*) and the third singular pluperfect subjunctive *recesset* (Merc. 73). But he also uses *discessisti* 'came out' (St. 395: *Hercules, qui deus sis, sane discessisti non bene*).

Similarly, Terence uses *decesse* 'give way' (Heaut. 31-2: *qui nuper fecit seruo currenti in uia/ decesse populum*) but also *intercessisse* 'occur' (Ad. 348-9: *postremo quando ego conscia mihi sum a me culpam esse hanc procul/ neque pretium neque rem ullam intercessisse*). Virgil uses *accestis* 'you encountered' (Aen. 1.200-1: *uos et Scyllaeam rabiem penitusque sonantis/ accestis scopulos*), but also *cessisse* 'leave' (Aen. 3.121, 297). From *dico,* Plautus uses *dixti* in Most. 552 (*dixtin quaeso? dixi, inquam, ordine omnia*), while a few lines before, we find *dixisti* (Most. 548: *numquid dixisti de illo quod dixi tibi?*). Similarly, in Trin. 567 *dixti* is used (*quid tecum, Stasime? de istoc quod dixti modo*), while in line 555 of the same play, the longer form occurs (555-6: ... *caue dixeris/ me tibi dixisse hoc. dixisti arcano satis*). The haplologized infinitive form *dixe* is used in Poen. 960, but the longer *dixisse* is also used, as illustrated above, and the subjunctive *dixisset* occurs in Mer. 993 (993-4: *si hercle sciuissem siue adeo ioculo dixisset mihi/ se illam amare*). For other forms see Lodge. In Terence, it is true, the haplologized forms of *dixi* outnumber the full forms on the order of three to one (see McGlynn), but *dixisti* is used (And. 593: *quid dixisti?,* Eun. 376: *dixisti pulchre,* and 1017), as is the infinitive *dixisse* (Hec. 451: *dixtin dudum illam dixisse se exspectare filium?;* Phorm. 453, 953) in addition to the haplologized infinitive *dixe* (Hec. 845: *sic te dixe opinor*). Haplologic forms are also used by later poets (e.g., *dixti,* Ovid, Her. 11.59), but certainly not to the exclusion of full forms (e.g., *dixisse* in Virg., Aen. 1.533, 3.166). Nor are haplologic forms lacking in prose; Cicero uses *dixti* both in his speeches (Caecin. 29.82, supported by Quintilian 9.3.22, who directly states *excussa syllaba*) and his philosophical writings (N.D. 3.23, Fin. 2.10). But the full forms of the type *dixisti* are far more common in all his writings; e.g. *dixisti* in Verr. 3.52, Fam. 5.2.3.13, 12.2.1.5; Fin. 4.24; *dixisset* Div. 2.133; *dixisse* Acad. 2.51, 137; Tusc. 3.30 (see Merguet and Oldfather et al.). From *iubeo* 'command', Platus uses the haplologic form *iusti* (Men. 1146: *numquid me morare, quin ego liber, ut tu iusti, siem?*), but *iussisti* is more common; *ut iussisti* in Men. 365, 367, Mil. 1267 and *iussisti* in other phrases in Bacch. 727, Men. 388, Mil. 899, Rud. 332. Terence uses *iusti* (Eun. 831: *quid facerem? ita ut tu iusti, soli creditast*) and the infinitive *iusse* (Heaut. 1001), but he also uses the full form of the infinitive, *iussisse* (Hec. 466). From compounds of *mitto,* Plautus has *promisti* (Curc. 709-10: *promistin, si liberali quisquam hanc assereret manu, omne argentum redditurum?;* cf. Curc. 490-1, below), *admisse* (Mil. 1287) but also *promisisse* (Curc. 490-1: *memento promisisse te, si quisquam hanc liberali/ causa manu adsereret, mihi omne argentum redditum eiri*), *promisisti* (Curc. 705, Poen. 422, Rud. 1217, 1384), and *demisisti* 'thrust' (Mer. 613).[61] Similarly, Terence has *amisti* 'let go' (Eun. 241, Hec. 251) but also *amisisti* (Eun. 322: *qua ratione amisisti;* cf. 293: *illam a conspectu amisi meo*) and *commisisti* 'entrusted' (Eun. 832), *commisissem* 'I would have entrusted' (Eun. 667).[62]

The use of haplologic perfect forms in Horace is of interest. Such forms occur in the *Sermones*: *divisse* 'divide' (2.3.169), *erepsemus* 'we would have surmounted' (1.5.79), *evasti* 'escaped' (2.7.68), *percusti* 'struck' (2.3.273), *surrexe* 'rise' (1.9.73). But even in the *Sermones,* there are full forms like *dixisse* (2.3.170), *cessisset* (1.7.31), *scripsisse* 'have written' (1.10.60), *vixisse* 'have lived' (1.1.117, 2.1.76).

The distribution of haplologic forms type *dixti* in Latin of the classical period has been characterized by Sommer (590) as follows: 'Man darf also wohl wenigstens für die Umgangsprache der klass. Zeit die Weiterexistenz der Kurzform annehmen, während die erlesenste Prosa der "korrekteren" den Vorzug gab.' Though this cautious statement is acceptable it is noteworthy that in Romance the full-form type *dixisti* became the norm. E.g. Old French 2sg. *maldisis* 'cursed' (Bartsch and Wiese 13.14), 2pl. *dëistes* (24.158); Sp. *dijiste* 'you said', subj. *dijese* etc.; Port. *disseste, dissesse* etc.

The types Skt. *gavyá* and Lat. *dixti* are two major examples of haplology within a paradigmatic set. The two types differ empirically. The Sanskrit haplologized forms are more commonly used than full forms such as *śravas-yáyā.* As we have seen, this situation in Sanskrit requires an explanation, which I have given (§ 3). The facts from Latin and Romance, on the other hand (§ 4.1), show that the haplologic forms of the type *dixti* cannot be said ever to have been absolutely favored over full forms of the type *dixisti*. This too is easily understood: *dixti* etc. always remained in function part of a paradigm, other members of which could exert analogic pressure for the retention of full forms.

5. The observations of § 4 require us to consider another case of paradigmatic haplology recently suggested by Szemerényi (1966). For, according to Szemerényi, we should accept the complete generalization of a haplologized member of a paradigm at the expense of its unhaplologized counterpart, while the haplologized form remained a functional part of the original paradigm. Szemerényi's explanation concerns the Vedic imperative forms in *-si* (e.g. *jeṣi* 'conquer', *neṣi* 'lead', *párṣi* 'carry across', *yákṣi* 'sacrifice', *vákṣi* 'carry'). On the basis of five Vedic passages in which *-si* forms appear in contexts where the imperative is syntactically out of place but where subjunctive forms would be in order,[63] Szemerényi concludes that the *-si* forms in question are formal subjunctives. He then assumes that (3), '... for the Vedic period we must posit the following *s*-subjunctive paradigms:

	stu-'praise'	*yaj*-'sacrifice'	*vah*- 'carry'
1 sg.	*stoṣāni*	**yakṣāni*	**vakṣāni*
2 sg.	*stoṣi*	*yakṣi*	*vakṣi*
3 sg.	*stoṣat*	*yakṣat*	*vakṣat*(*i*)'

The expected second singular forms of the *s*-aorist subjunctives of *yā* 'go', *yam* 'hold', and *sad* 'sit down' are **yāsasi*, **yaṃsasi*, and **satsasi*. Szemerényi (3) accounts for the actually attested forms *yāsi*, *yáṃsi*, *sátsi* by haplologic shortening: '... the actual forms derive from their antecedents by simple haplology: *yāsi* is *yā*(*sa*)*si*, *satsi* is *sat*(*sa*)*si*, etc.' Szemerényi has also to encounter the difficulty brought up by the fact that very few of the verbs in question would have had in Indic a sequence *-sasi* in the second singular of the *s*-subjunctive. For all but seven of the verb roots are so structured that the suffixation of *-s-* would result in a sequence with *-ṣ-*; e.g. *jeṣ-, neṣ-, parṣ-, yakṣ-, vakṣ-*. Szemerényi therefore assumes (4) that, '... the subjunctives in question still had the form **naisasi, *jaisasi, *parsasi,* etc., in the (early?) period of Aryan community, and were then reduced to **naisi, parsi,* etc.' Finally, Szemerényi has to account for the fact that in the second singular of the putative subjunctives the ending *-si* is used to the near-total exclusion of *-s,* while in the corresponding third singular the ending *-t,* not *-ti,* is most common. This contrasts with the situation in the *-iṣ*-aorist, where only *-iṣas* occurs in the second singular subjunctive, parallel to the third singular in *-iṣat;* see Macdonell 1910:§ 530. Szemerényi's explanation is (5): 'But it is obvious that, if original *s*-subjunctive 2 sg. forms in *-s* and *-si* coexisted at an early stage, the reduction by haplology left more viable forms in the latter case than in the former, and the distinctive forms in *-si* had an edge on the overshort forms in *-s*.'

The above discussion is based primarily on the fact that *-si* forms occasionally occur in contexts where they function as subjunctives (see fn. 63). However, this applies to only five Rigvedic instances of *-si* forms out of nearly 150. We must then ask whether these isolated cases are indeed to be considered valuable relics of the original function of the *-si* forms or rather the results of innovation by the Vedic poets. We may note first that the forms of *sad* cited by Szemerényi (above) are not valid evidence for his thesis. The subjunctive *sátsat* is clearly a new creation of the Vedic poets; see Cardona 1963 and Narten 1964:262-3 with fn. 827a. Nor can the form *sátsi* be considered the haplologic shortening of an Indo-Iranian subjunctive **satsasi. Sátsi* is an imperative formed analogically to the imperative *sada* after the pattern *yája/ yákṣi, váha/ vákṣi;* see Cardona 1965: § 4.1. Further, there is at least one Rigvedic instance of an unambiguous imperative form used in a context requiring a formal subjunctive or indicative. In 8.93.19, the imperative *ā́ bhara* 'bring' is used in an interrogative: *káyā tváṃ na ūtyā́bhí prá mandase vṛṣan/ káyā stotṛbbhya ā́ bhara* 'With what aid, oh bull (Indra), will you come to us and rejoice? With what (aid) bring (...) for the chanters of praise.' Here, *ā́ bhara* is totally unexpected (cf. Oldenberg 1912: ad loc.) The octosyllabic sequence *íṣaṃ stotṛ́bhya ā́ bhara* is a standard phrase; cf. 9.20.4: *abhyàrṣa bṛhádyáśo maghávadbhyo dhruváṃ rayím/ íṣaṃ stotṛ́bhya ā́ bhara* 'Rush (,Soma,) to great fame and firm wealth for the generous ones ...', and 5.6.1-10, where *íṣaṃ stotṛ́bhya ā́ bhara* is the refrain. 8.93.19c is then explainable as the result of replacing *íṣaṃ* of the standard phrase by *káyā,* in accord with the wording of the previous part of the verse. In Vedic poetry, the second singular imperative and third singular subjunctive are intimately related as modal variants; see Cardona 1965: § 3 with ref. In 8.93.20, the third singular injunctive is used: *kásya ... suté ... raṇat* 'At whose pressed Soma will he take pleasure?' The modal alternations in which the imperative second singular partakes, together with the influence of *káyā* from 8.93.19a, satisfactorily accounts for the aberrant use of the imperative *ā́ bhara* in 8.93.19c. Similarly, the unusual use of *-si* forms in contexts where the subjunctive is expected is satisfactorily explained as follows (Cardona 1965:9-10, similarly, Narten 202): 'The alternation pattern *-si/ -sat* used in a system of modal variation (2sg. impv./ 3sg. subj.)

resulted in the extension of the function and syntactic distribution of the latter to the former.' It therefore seems unjustifiable to say (Szemerényi 1966:3): 'The evidence itself demands the opposite conclusion: that the *-si* forms are subjunctives, both originally and in ACTUAL USAGE' [Emphasis mine]. The *-si* forms are to be classed as imperatives in Vedic. Whether they are to be derived historically from subjunctive forms by haplology is another question.

Szemerényi's accounting for the use of *-si* in the second singular of the putative subjunctive as opposed to *-t* in the third singular does not seem wholly satisfactory. Both *-s* and *-si* were certainly equally distinctive as second person markers. If, on the other hand, we argue that phonologic developments in a sequence *consonant - s* (e.g. 2sg. inj. *yāṭ* < *yaj* 'sacrifice') blurred the morphologic analysis *root – suffix – ending,* then we should compare the development in the athematic root aorists. The type *ágan* (2, 3sg. < *gam* 'go') was replaced by a thematic type based on a stem *gáma-* followed by clearly demarked endings. By the same token, if *-si* and *-s* forms were competitive members of a subjunctive paradigm, we should expect forms in *-sas*(*i*) to have been retained due to the influence of 3sg. *-sat*(*i*), 3pl. *-san,* as in the case of Lat. *dixisti.* Nor would it be justified to claim that metrical factors favored *-si* forms resulting from haplology over the haplologic *-s* forms. For then we should also have to abandon Szemerényi's claim that the *-si* forms were subjunctives pure and simple. The *-si* forms do indeed meet metrical requirements, but as trochaic equivalents of iambic IMPERATIVE forms of the type *yája* (see Cardona 1965: § 4). I therefore find it difficult to accept Szemerényi's statement (1966:5) that, 'at one time the 2 sg.

[subjunctive] only used the haplologized *-si*-forms.' Nor should we straddle the fence, as Szemerényi does when he says (1966:6): '... the so-called *-si* imperatives are in truth simple 2 sg. *s*-aorist subjunctives. They were shortened at an early date from the full form in *-sa-si,* which led to their formal isolation, though syntactically they continued in their earlier role, including their ability to be used in relative constructions demanding the subjunctive.' If the *-si* forms continued to function as subjunctives, we should expect the members of the *s*-aorist subjunctive paradigm to have influenced them.

On the other hand, the generalized use of such putative haplologized subjunctive forms could be justified if from earliest Indo-Iranian they were already limited to use as imperatives, thus isolating them functionally from the subjunctive paradigm. The *-si* forms would then not be of the type Lat. *dixti* (§ 4) but more of the type Skt. *ṛjūyá* (§ 2). The question now is how to account for this limitation. It would be too simplistic to say merely that the formal isolation consequent on the haplologic shortening of *-sasi* to *-si* resulted in the limitation of the subjunctive, which could also function as an imperative, to the latter function alone. Consider, for example, parallel cases usually treated in considerations of semantic change. French *vif* means 'lively' as opposed to Spanish *vivo,* which means both 'lively' and 'alive, living', a duality of meaning already attested for Latin *vivus.* In such a case, it is of course not merely formal isolation resulting from phonetic change which accounts for the limitation in meaning. In French, 'living' is expressed by the participial form *vivant,* now directly connected with the verb *vivre* 'live', while in Spanish *viviendo* functions only as a participle to *vivir,* not as an adjective meaning 'alive' (cf. Meillet 1948:237-8 for this and other examples). Accepting Szemerényi's suggestion that the Vedic *-si* imperatives are *s*-subjunctives in origin (but rejecting his use of the actual Vedic evidence), the functional limitation is explainable on the basis of the observable alternation between second singular imperatives and third singular subjunctives. We can say that within this alternation pattern, in the sigmatic aorist, which originally had no formal imperative, *-si* (< *-sasi*) was shifted to exclusively imperative value. This would account for the extreme paucity of real subjunctive forms of the second singular in the Vedic *s*-aorist (*darṣasi* 'burst', *jeṣas, vakṣas*). In addition, we can now appeal to the argument that *-s* (< *-sas*) was eliminated in favor of *-si,* which provided a more clearly defined imperative marker for the sigmatic aorist. However, this does not mean that we can completely eliminate the possibility that there also existed imperative *-si* forms which were not subjunctive in origin and which contributed to the total shift of the *-si* forms which were subjunctive in origin to imperatival use.

6. In a recent article, Hoenigswald (1964) argues persuasively for abandoning the distinction traditionally made between major and minor processes of sound change; one of the latter is haplology. While I agree with Hoenigswald's main point, I think a brief discussion will not be out of place. After citing two examples each from Greek (*hē[mi]médimnos, am[phi]phoreús,* on which see above, § 4 with fn. 59) and Latin (*sti[pi]pendium, nu[tri]trix*), Hoenigswald says (210): 'In spite of what is usually implied about these haplologies, I see no reason not to ascribe "regularity", i.e., sound-law character to them. On the Greek side, I cannot find an important number of instances in which open syllables in the interior of a word are allowed to begin with the same consonant—except in cases of members of inflectional paradigms (say, like *patētéos* from *patéō*). Such exceptions mean very little if we consider the notorious strength of analogic regularization within verb paradigms.' He then goes on to note that examples of haplology 'seem to be mostly compounds' and rightly observes that compounds 'are just as notoriously much less exposed to analogy and much more to the normal obscuration of their etymology.' He concludes (210) that, 'we cannot expect much in the way of crucial material that is derivationally simple and thus absolutely immune to possible analogic influences.'

Hoenigswald's statement about compounds is, as we have seen (§ 4), both traditional and apt to be a bit misleading. The important fact is not that most cases of haplologic shortening are compounds or derivatives by suffixation but that, though such shortening can and does occur in all the environments given in § 4, it commonly persists only in types (b1) and (b2), that is, in compounds, suffixal derivatives, and the special case of suffixal derivation called inflection. This calls for two observations. First, haplologic shortening is another piece of evidence showing that lasting phonologic changes, at least in Indo-European, usually occur within the bounds of single syntactic units, not in the larger context of what may be called sentence sandhi.[64] Secondly, while for compounds and suffixal derivatives, we can appeal to the fact that the resultant items are separate lexical items commonly escaping analogic remodeling, this is not enough. We have also to consider the factor of the frequency with which speakers encounter the conditions for haplology. This will account for the generalizations seen in the Sanskrit infinitive marker *-tavai* (§ 4(a1)) as well as the persistence of haplologized forms of the type Lat. *dixti* in spite of the paradigmatic force for retaining the longer forms type *dixisti*. In addition, as we have seen for the Vedic *-yā́* forms, we have to consider all the possible influences of subsystems within a language for the retention or elimination of haplologized forms. A language is, after all, not just a mass; it is an evolving system of subsystems, and within each of these conditions will occur for haplologic shortening at different times, in different dialects, and susceptible to analogic forces leading to elimination or retention of the shortened forms. I have already noted (fn. 55) that for the retention of haplologized *pākyā̀* in Vedic we have to consider the influence of the instrumental *dhīryā̀*, in which the conditions for haplology did not occur. Similarly, in Lat. *altitudo* 'height', where the same conditions for haplology occur as in *consuetudo* 'custom' (< *consuetus* 'accustomed'), we have to consider influence of *longitudo* 'length', in which the conditions for haplology did not occur. Again, though the same conditions for haplologic shortening occurred in the Latin frequentatives such as *cantitare* 'sing', *dictitare* 'assert', *ductitare* 'lead, marry, deceive', we have to consider that such frequentatives coexisted with others such as *cantare* 'sing', *dictare* 'dictate', *ductare* 'lead, deceive'. The preservation of the two types could have contributed to maintaining full forms where the conditions for haplologic shortening obtained.

In all such cases the question arises whether a haplologic shortening was kept from being generalized or the full form restored after such shortening. Perhaps for ancient languages the question is unanswerable. But the coexistence of competing forms is a common feature of linguistic development. Hence we cannot rule out a priori that some full forms are actually unhaplologized, not simply reformed after the effect of a 'sound law'. The same applies of course to what is traditionally called regular sound change, that is, to the established sound laws. It seems an oversimplification, epitomized by Bloomfield's famous aphorism *Phonemes change* (1932:227, 1933:351), to say that sweeping sound changes take effect throughout a whole linguistic system and that only afterwards are certain forms restored analogically. Even less justifiable is the aphoristic statement (Hackett 1958:453): 'sound change tends to irregularize, while analogy tends to regularize.' A sound change (*-yā́* < *-yā́yā*) did result in an irregularity in the Vedic nominal system; but this very irregularity was buttressed analogically. The conditions for conditioned sound changes occur in different subsystems of a language, where different forces have their effects,[65] and there is no essential contradiction between the two statements commonly made in historical and comparative linguistics (cf. Meillet 29) that sound laws are regular—that is, that sound changes are generalized—and that each word has its history.

APPENDIX OF *-YA* FORMS DISCUSSED

(Asterisk before a *-yā́* form indicates that this is the only nominal form to occur in the Rigveda of the putative *-yā́*-stem.)

-yā form	*-ya*-verb	*-yu*-nominal	Other forms	References
I. (Type § 1.1)				
1. **aśvayā́*		*aśvayú-*		§ 1.1a
2. see III.6	*kratūyá-*			§ 1.3a
3. **gavyā́*	*gavyá-*	*gavyú-*	*gávya-*, *gavyá*, *gavyáya-* 'of cows'	§ 1.1a
4. **gavyayā́*		*gavyayú-*	see I.3	§ 1.1a
5. **tvāyā́*	*tvāyá-*	*tvāyú-*		§§ 1.1f, 2, 2.2
6. **rathayā́*		*rathayú-*		§ 1.1a
7. *varasyā́*			*varasyā́m*	§ 1.2e
8. **varivarsyā́*	see II.11			§§ 1.2e, 2.2
9. **vasūyā́*	*vasūyá-*	*vasūyú-*		§ 1.1c
10. **vīrayā́*	see II.12, III.2	*vīrayú-*		§ 1.1b, fn.5
11. *śravasyā́*	*śravasyá-*	*śravasyú-*	*śravasyáyā*, *śravasyà-* 'famed'	§ 1.1d
12. **sukṣetriyā́*				§ 1.1c, fn.9
13. **sugātuyā́*	see II.4			§ 1.1c, fn.9
14. **sumnayā́*	*sumnāyá-*	*sumnayú-*		§ 1.1e
II. (Type § 1.2)				
1. see III.7	*apasyá-*	*apasyú-*	*apasyā́m*, *apasyáyā*, *apasyà-* 'active'	§ 1.3a
2. **uruṣyā́*	*uruṣyá-*	*uruṣyú-*		§ 1.2e

-yā form	*-ya*-verb	*-yu*-nominal	Other forms	References
3. see V.2	*ṛtāyá-*			§ 2
4. see I.13	*gātūyá-*			fn.9
5. **daśasyā́*	*daśasyá-*			§ 1.2d
6. **duvoyā́*	*duvasyá-*	*duvasyú-,* *duvoyú-*		§ 1.2a
7. **brahmaṇyā́*	*brahmaṇyá-*			§ 1.2c, 2.1
8.	*manasyá-*			§ 1.3d
9. *vacasyā́*	*vacasyá-*	*vacasyú-*	*vacasyā́m,* *vacasyáyā*	§§ 1.2b, 2.1
10. *varasyā́*			see I.7	§ 1.2e
11. **varivasyā́*	*varivasyá-*			§§ 1.2e, 2.2
12. see I.10	*vīrayá-*	see I.10		fn.5
13. see I.14	*sumnayá-*	see I.14		fn.15
III. (Type § 1.3)				
1.	*ṛjūyá-*	*ṛjūyú-*		§ 2.
2. see I.10	*vīrayá-*	see I.10		fn.7
3. **vedhasyā́*				§§ 1.3c, 2.4
4. **śraddhāmanasyā́*			cf. *sumanasyá-*	§ 1.3d
5. *sukṛtyā́*			*sukṛtyáyā*	§ 1.3a
6. *sukratūyā́*	see I.2		*sukratūyáyā*	§§ 1.3b, 2.4
7. *svapasyā́*	*svapasyá-*		*svapasyáyā*	§§ 1.3a, 2.4
IV. (Type § 1.4)				
1. **irasyā́*	*irasyá-*			§ 1.4a
2. **iṣudhyā́*	*iṣudhyá-*	*iṣudhyú-*		§ 1.4d
3. *devayajyā́*		*-yájyu-* 'who sacrifices'	*devayajyáyā,* *devayájya-* 'sacrifice to the gods'	§§ 1.4c, 2.2
4. **vipanyā́*		*vipanyú-*		§ 1.4b

-*yā* form	-*ya*-verb	-*yu*-nominal	Other forms	References
V.				
1. *_ṛjūyā́_	see III.1			§ 2
2. *_ṛtayā́_	see II.3			§ 2
3. *_tvāyā́_	see I.5	see I.5		§§ 1.1f, 2, 2.2
4. *_brahmaṇyā́_	see II.17			§§ 1.2c, 2.1
5. *_vapuṣyā́_			_vapuṣyà-_	§ 2.4, fn.49,50
6. *_vedhasyā́_				§§ 1.3c, 2.4
7. *_sumnayā́_ (AV)	see I.14	see I.14		§ 2
8. *_suśravasyā́_	see I.11	see I.11		§ 2.4

FOOTNOTES

[1] On the derivation of the type *gavyáti*, cf. Pāṇini 3.1.8. Patañjali ad 3.1.8 vt. 2 directly cites *gavyati* as the equivalent of *gāmicchati* 'desires a cow'. Yāska (Nir. 6.31) also says that *idaṃyu-* is the equivalent of *idaṃkāmayamāna-* 'desiring this', and quotes 1.51.14c *vasūyúrindraḥ* 'Indra is a seeker of treasure'. But Yāska also admits the meaning 'possessing that' (*athāpitadvadarthe bhāṣyate*) and adopts this meaning for the passage cited (*vasumānityarthaḥ*); cf. Sāyaṇa ad 1.51.14c, 8.92.30. Pāṇini's rule 3.1.8 (*supa ātmanaḥ kyac*) is so worded that the denominative is formed with suffix *-ya-* when the object expressed by the base noun is desired for oneself (*ātmanaḥ*). Hence the derived Vedic nominals formed with *-u-* (by Pāṇ. 3.2.170) and the abstract in *-ā* (*-yā*) by Pāṇ. 3.3.102, 4.1.4 would also have this restriction. In Vedic, however, the denominative is also formed to express desiring something for someone else. The example cited by Patañjali (II.16.14) is VS 4.34: *mā́ tvā vṛ́kā aghāyávo vidan* 'May wolves wishing you harm not find you.' This Vedic usage is accomodated by using Pāṇini's formulation of another rule (7.4.37) as indicating that the Vedic type was accounted for by Pāṇini. See also below, fn.9.

[2] Supply *rā́dhas*. Cf. 7.77.5d: *gómadáśvāvadráthavacca rā́dhaḥ* 'the gift of cows, horses, chariots'; similarly, 5.57.7ab. On *vī* 'pursue' see Renou 1958b:40.

[3] 4.17.16ab = 10.131.3cd. For the bucket image, cf. 10.42.2cd: *kóśaṃ ná pū́rṇaṃ vásunā nyṛ̀ṣṭamā́ cyāvaya maghadéyāya* ... 'Draw (Indra) to bounty granting like a lowered bucket full of wealth.'

[4] For *gavyā́* in 7.18.7d (*gavyā́ tṛ́tsubhyo ajagan yudhā́ nṛn* 'In quest of cows for the Tṛtsu did [Indra] encounter heroes in battle') Grassmann 390 (sv. *gavyā́*) gives a gloss 'Kampfbegierde'. It has also been suggested (see Oldenberg 1912:20) that *gavyā́* mean 'consisting of cows' (< *gavyá-*). Oldenberg (loc. cit.) and Geldner reject these proposals; Oldenberg: 'aus Kuhbegierde', Geldner: 'aus Verlangen nach Kühe'. Oldenberg also refers to 7.31.3 (see above) as showing that Indra is *gavyú-* for those who befriend him. We may also compare 7.33.5d: *urúṃ tṛ́tsubhyo akṛṇodu lokám* '(Indra) made wide space for the Tṛtsu' with passages such as 7.27.5, 8.46.10 (see above), since *urú kṛ* is equivalent to *várivas kṛ* (see § 1.2f).

[5] *Vīráṃ dā* as the equivalent of *vīrayá-* places this denominative in the type § 1.2. Cf. also 9.9.9ab: *pávamāna máhi śrávo gā́máśvaṃ rāsi* 'While being purified, give us (,Soma,) great fame, cows, horses'; 9.11.9ab: *pávamāna suvī́ryaṃ rayíṃ soma rirīhi naḥ* '... give us sons and wealth'. I consider the type *gavyá-* only in § 1.1 for ease of presentation and also because in the Vedic contexts it is not always easy to separate 'seek for

someone' and 'give to someone'. Cf. also of Soma, 9.98.4: *sá hí tváṃ ... vásu mártyāya dāśúṣe ... rayíṃ ... vivāsasi* 'You seek to win wealth for the mortal who renders proper sacrificial homage.'

[6] On *śuṣ* and derivatives, see Thieme 1951:5, Renou 1958a:44-5, 1960: 57-8, 1962:114.

[7] In 10.128.5b (*víśve devā́sa ihá vīrayadhvam* 'You all-gods ...') Grassmann 1317 and Geldner ('zeiget euch hier als Männer') interpret *vīrayá-* as of the type § 1.3. However, verse 5a of the same hymn is *urú naḥ kṛṇota* 'make broad space for us' (cf. § 1.2f), and 5c has *mā́ hāsmahi prajáyā* 'let us not be devoid of progeny,' so that *vīrayadhvam* of 5b can be interpreted as of type § 1.1. In 1.116.5 (*... tádavīrayethām ... samudré ... yádaśvinā ūháthurbhujyúmástam* 'then, Aśvin, did you act heroically in the ocean, when you returned Bhujyu to his home') and 10.103.6 (*gotrabhídaṃ govídam ... jáyantam ... imáṃ ... ánu vīrayadhvam-indram* 'Be heroes in imitation of Indra, who splits stalls, finds cows, conquers'), *vīrayá-* 'behave as a hero' (type § 1.3) is most appropriate. Cf. also fn.5.

[8] On 1.165.1 cf. Renou 1962:114.

[9] Part of the passage (*vasūyā́ ca yajāmahe*) is quoted by Patañjali (II.24.10), where the derivation from *vasūyá-* is given. *Sukṣetriyā́* and *sugātuyā́* are cited in the Mahābhāṣya ad vt. 1 ad Pāṇ. 7.1.39 (III.256.24). *Sugātuyā́* is straightforward, though a denominative *sugātuyá-* does not occur. The denominative *gātuyá-* is of type § 1.2; 8.16.11-12: *sá naḥ ... pārayāti svastí .../ ... sá tváṃ na ... gātuyāca/ ácchā ca naḥ sumnáṃ neṣi* 'He shall transport us to well being; make a path for us, lead us to happiness.' *Gātuyá-* is semantically akin to *gātuvíd-* 'who finds a path' (e.g. 8.66.14d). But a *gātuyá-* 'seek a path' is also possible; cf. 8.19.16cd, where *gātuvíttama-* 'excellent finders of paths' refers to the chanters.

[10] On *juhvā́* 'with the tongue' cf. Renou 1956:106.

[11] The interpretation given assumes the pivot position of *víśvā ... vā́ryāṇi,* which is then construed with both the preceding and following.

[12] The interpretation agrees essentially with that of Renou 1964a:31, though I think we should supply the object of *ná śiśrathat.* Thieme 1949:34 fn.3 translates, '... ist er (Agni), ..., [vom Priester, der den Feuerbrand trägt] in die rechte Hand genommen werden. Er (der Priester) lässt die Speicherschaft [*aratí* in Thieme's opinion] nicht sich lockern, wenn er nach Siegesruhm strebt ...' The closest parallel to the passage is supplied by 9.18.4ab: *ā́ yó víśvāni vā́ryā vásūni hástayor dadhé* 'Who holds in his hands the choicest tresures'. I think Thieme's objection against supplying *vásūni* in 1.128.6 is not cogent, though I agree with him in not invoking, as Geldner does ad 1.128.6, word haplology; ellipsis is common. Moreover, *vásūni* is quite possibly to be understood as suggested by *vásu* in the verse; cf. Bloomfield 1916:132. And Thieme has in any case to supply *aratí* as an object for *śiśrathat.*

[13] Semantically akin to *sumati;* see fn.15.

[14] Cf. 3.42.6: *vidmā́ hí tvā dhanaṃjayáṃ ... ádhā te sumnámīmahe*

'We know you (Indra) are a conqueror of wealth ..., then we seek your favor.'

[15] The denominative *sumnāyá-* is also equivalent to *sumnáṃ rā* 'grant favor'; 1.114.9b: *rā́svā ... sumnámasmé* 'Grant us (,Rudra,) your favor'. In the same hymn, after saying, 'We would gain your favor through sacrifice to the gods' (3a: *aśyā́ma te sumatíṃ devayajyáyā*), the poet goes on (3c): *sumnāyánnídviśo asmā́kamā́ cara* 'Come to our clans, granting favor.' On *sumná-* cf. Renou 1957:50.

[16] For other texts in which this frequently used verse occurs see Bloomfield 1906: sv. *sīrā yuñjanti*. On AV 3.17.1, a variant of 10.101.4, see below, § 2.

[17] Cf. 8.81.5bc: *śrávatsā́ma gīyámānam/ abhí rā́dhasā jugurat* 'May he (Indra) heark to the chant as it is sung; may he return the chant with a gift.'

[18] On this verse cf. Blair 24, who translates *tvāyā́* 'because of (devotion to) you'. As we shall note (§ 2.2) simply 'for you' is also acceptable.

[19] On *tvāyā́* in 3.46.5, 5.32.12, 6.1.13, 7.29.3, see §§ 2, 2.2. I omit discussion of two passages (7.18.21, 8.61.9) containing *tvāyā́,* since a properly detailed discussion of these would lead too far afield from our immediate subject; see Oldenberg 1912:ad 7.18.21.

[20] For the difference in case usage cf. *námas kṛ* (plus dative) and *namasyá-* 'do obeisance' (plus accusative).

[21] Geldner translates in 4.2.9 'Eifer für dich betätigt', Renou 1964b:4 '(qui) met en toi sa pensée-privilégiée'. Sāyaṇa glosses *dúvas* simply as 'honor, obeisance' (*paricaryām*).

[22] Note in passing that *vacasyáyā* and *vacasyā́* were used by the poets in different cadences; the first in a jagatī (⏑-⏑-), the second in a triṣṭubh (-⏑-⏑); see also Lanman 357.

[23] Alternately, *írāvatī ... daśasyā́* can be interpreted as an address by the chanter to heaven and earth; thus Sāyaṇa, who glosses *daśasyā́* as 'through desire to give' (*ditsayā*). The interpretation reflected in my translation is that of Oldenberg (1912:65), followed by Geldner. Of variants of the Rigvedic verse, that of TS 1.2.13.12, MS 1.2.9 (18.19) is interesting: *mánave yaśasyè* 'full of fame for Manu', with the adjective *yaśasyà-* in construction with *ródasī.*

[24] Cf. below, § § 2, 2.1.

[25] For *apasyá-, ṛtāyá-, manasyá-*, see § § 1.3a, 1.3d, 2, respectively.

[26] *várivas kṛ* is one of the phrases, the other being *námas kṛ* (cf. fn.20), for which Pāṇ. 3.1.19 provides a *-yá* denominative.

[27] Geldner and Renou 1959:33 take *varasyā́m* as the complement of *ā́ ... gantá.*

[28] Pāṇ. 3.1.11 provides for denominatives having this meaning. According to the Bhāṣya on Pāṇ. 3.1.11, a denominative *yaśasyate* also had the meaning 'behave as one who is famous'. This is of interest. There are accentually differentiated *yáśas-* 'fame' and *yaśás-* 'famed'. It is theoretically possible that *apasyá-* 'perform work' then be ambiguously derivable from *ápas-* 'work' and *apás-* 'active'. This possi-

bility extends to *brahmaṇyá-* (§ 2.1), derivable from *brahmán-* 'who uses *bráhman-*'.

[29] Cf. 6.15.10d: *prá havyámagniramṛteṣu vocat* 'Let Agni announce the oblation among the immortal (gods)'; 7.39.3d: *śrótā dūtásya jagmúṣo no asyá* 'Hearken (,gods,) to this our messenger (Agni) as he goes (to you).' On *makhá-* see Renou 1958a:62. In view of what has been said of *svapasyá-*, in 10.11.6, Renou's 'il s'active à l'oeuvre' (1965:8) seems better nuancé than Geldner's 'verrichtet gutes Werk'.

[30] *Svapasyáyā* occurs in four passages other than those cited.

[31] *Sukṛtyā́* occurs once more, 4.35.8a: *yé devā́so ábhavatā sukṛtyā́* '(You Rbhu) who were gods by virtue of your artisanship.' On the Rbhu and their epithets see the brief discussion in Gonda 1959:121-2. *Sukṛtyáyā* occurs in six passages other than 4.35.2.

[32] For a brief discussion of this word see Gonda 1959:37.

[33] Cf. Thieme 1949:21. On 10.122.6 see also Lüders 439 and Renou 1965:28, 97.

[34] A denominative *śraddhāmanasyá-* * 'be faith-minded' is probably to be posited. Compare the relation between *sumánas-* 'well-disposed, happy' and *sumanasyá-;* 10.51.5d: *váha havyā́ni sumanasyámānaḥ* '(Agni,) carry the oblations, well-disposed'.

[35] Cf. also Chāndogyopaniṣad 7.4.1, where *saṃkalpa-* 'discriminatory conception' is said to be more than *manas: yadā vai saṃkalpayate'tha manasyati* 'when one forms a discriminatory conception, then one intends.'

[36] E.g. 10.174.2cd: *abhí pṛtanyántaṃ tiṣṭhābhí yó na irasyáti* 'Be against him who fights against us, who wishes to harm us.' Cf. AV 1.29.2, a repetition of this Rigvedic verse except that for RV *irasyáti* it has *durasyáti*. Pāṇ. 7.4.36 provides for *durasyati* equivalent to *duṣṭamicchati* 'wishes wrong'.

[37] *Vipanyáyā* occurs in three passages other than that cited.

[38] For the singular verb with plural pronoun (*vaḥ*) cf. the references given in Cardona 1965:3-4.

[39] Uvaṭa and Mahīdhara ad VS 4.8, a repetition of the Rigvedic verse, interpret *iṣudhyati* (glossed *prārthayate* 'prays, requests') with object *savitṛ-* Of the other places where the Rigvedic verse occurs, TS 1.2.2.1 is of interest. It has *iṣudhyasi* (2sg.) and the padapāṭha interprets *rāyá* as *rāyáḥ* (gen. sg. or acc. pl.). Sāyaṇa interprets: *dhanyasya ... īśiṣe* 'You hold dominion over wealth.'

[40] *Iṣudhyá-*, though not denominative in Indic, has a denominative counterpart in Iranian; Av. *išuiδya-* 'pray' from *išud-* 'prayer'; see Lommel. Humbach 28 suggests that Av. *išud-* is an enlargement of *iš-* and means 'Kraft, Kraftspendung'. He then compares RV *pṛkṣúdh-* (which Renou 1958b:67 renders 'instruments de jouissance'). But *pṛkṣúdh-* occurs only once, in 1.141.4, where it may well be a nonce form after *vīrúdh-* 'plant'; cf. Oldenberg 1909a:ad loc. Further, *śurúdh-*, another supposed *-udh*-form, probably has nothing to do with Gk. *korénnūmi* 'fill, satiate' (suggestion made in Debrunner 1954:§ 301); see

Thieme's explanation (1941) of *śurúdh-* 'das Vieh mehrend' < *(p)śu-rudh-* and cf. Debrunner 1954:Nachträge 936.

[41] On *gṛhate* see Wackernagel 1932.

[42] *Tvāyā́* as a derivative from *tva-* is plausibly explained as a Vedic innovation starting from *tvāyā́* < *tvāyā́-*, abstract of *tvāyá*. In a passage like 6.1.13 (b) *tvāyā́* is in fact justifiably interpretable as from *tvāyā́-*. On the basis of the usage exemplified by 4.4.14 (a) this form could then be reanalyzed as directly derived from *tva-* (cf. below on *ṛjūyā́* etc. for the ambiguity of such forms). *Tvāyā́* was thus interpreted as containing the instrumental suffix *-yā́* (see § 2.3). The use of formal instrumentals in locative function (see § 2.1) together with the usage exemplified by 7.18.1 (c) supported the use of *tvāyā́* in locative function. For the use of *tvāyā́* in dative function and parallels for this usage, see below, § 2.2. Insler, with whom I am pleased to agree in independently interpreting most occurrences of *tvāyā́* as locatival or datival in function, considers (231-2) *tvāyā́* archaic in both these functions. The locative *tvāyā́* reflects, in his opinion, the type Av. *grīvaya* < *grīvā-* 'nape'; 231: 'What we encounter in *tvāyā́* is a locative formed to the archaic *m*-less locative of *ā*-stems in Vedic, the first proof of such a formation in Indic.' For datival *tvāyā́* Insler adopts a suggestion made by Cowgill; 232: '... perhaps dat. *tvāyā́* also reflects an equally archaic form **tvā́i* built to **jihvā́i*, with the old fem. dat. ending **-āi* as in *feminae* and [Gk.] *theâi*' (transliteration mine). Insler's additional evidence for Indic locative forms in *-āyā* from feminine *ā*-stems seems very tenuous. He interprets (233-4) *ū́rmyāyās* of 6.10.4c as a locative in agreement with *ū́rmyāsvā́* of the parallel passage 6.48.6c. He then concludes that *ū́rmyāyās* is a redactional misunderstanding for **ū́rmyāyā*. That the genitive *rāmyā́ṇām* occurs in another parallel passage (7.9.2d), Insler dispenses with quite weakly by saying (234 fn. 18): '... but it does, after all, belong to a different *maṇḍala*.' Another supposed locative in *-āyā* is *kanā́yā* in 10.61.5cd: *púnastádā́ vṛhati yátkanā́yā duhitúrā́ ánubhṛtamanarvā́* 'Again he pulls out of his virgin daughter what was inserted (in the virgin daughter) ...' Clearly, the sentence as it stands represents a fuller: ... *tadāvṛhati kanāyā duhituryatkānāyāṃ duhitaryā anubhṛtam* with abl. *kanāyā duhituḥ* in construction with *ā vṛhati* and loc. *kanāyāṃ duhitari* in construction with *anubhṛtam*. Insler (243) states: 'The correct construction must coordinate *tát* with *ā́ vṛhati* and *yát* with everything after it ...' Note, however, a construction such as 4.32.11 *tā́ te gṛṇanti* ... *yā́ni cakártha paúṃsyā/ sutéṣvindra* ... 'They praise with hymns at the Soma pressings those manly deeds which you have performed, Indra ...', where *sutéṣu* is to be construed with *tā́* ... *gṛṇanti*. Insler concludes that *kanāyā* is a true locative. As for *duhitúḥ*, Insler (235) considers this 'an alteration by the redactors from **duhitár* since there occur no other *i*-less locatives to *ṛ*-stems in RV ...' He goes on: 'Support to this view is offered by the identical mistake in Mbh. 4.72.6 *snuṣāyāṃ duhitur vāpi putre cātmani vā*, which, according to the correct judgment of Ludwig, stands for *snuṣāyāṃ duhitar*.' Insler neglects to say that the critical edition of

the Mahābhārata now reads (4.67.6) *snuṣāyā duhitur* ..., which makes perfect sense. That *duhitúḥ* in a hymn of the tenth maṇḍala should be the sole representative of an archaic endingless locative form **duhitar* might strike some as stretching the otherwise perfectly justifiable principle of redactional modernization of the RV text in order to justify a historical explanation of *tvāyā́* as from **tvā́i ā́*. Since in view of *rāmyā́ṇām* in 7.2.9 *ū́rmyāyās* of 6.10.4 is correctly to be taken as a genitive, I seriously doubt the wisdom of insisting on interpreting *kanā́yā* in 10.61.5 as a formal locative. Since, further, there is, as I indicated above, an internal explanation for the locative use of *tvāyā́*, I think Insler's hypothesis is to be rejected. Especially since, in any case, Insler is forced to have recourse to *tvāyā́-* < *tvāyā́-* in order to account for the accentuation of *tvāyā́* supposedly from **tvā́i ā́* (loc. and dat.); 232: 'Therefore, I believe, the best interpretation of the final accentuation of these 2 words is to be ascribed to a redactional change due to a similarity in formation between them and the frequently occurring instrumentals in *-ā-yā́*.' Finally, I would note that, to be convincing, Insler should have gone into the problem posed by the fact that the postposition *ā́* he assumes for dat. **tvā́i ā́* does not commonly occur with a dative; cf. Wackernagel 1910 and Wackernagel-Debrunner 94. See also Oldenberg 1909a:15-6 (ad 1.17.3).

[43] *Devayajyā́* in 10.70.1d: *ūrdhvó bhava* ... *devayajyā́* 'Be erect (,Agni,) ...', can be interpreted as a locative. Cf. 6.63.4: *ūrdhvó* ... *agnī́radhvaréṣvasthāt* 'Agni was erect at the sacrifices.' In 10.30.11a *devayajyā́* might be taken as having either locative or dative value; cf. Pischel 532-4 for a discussion of parallel passages and see below, § 2.2 end.

[44] See Lüders 420-1, 476-86. Whether or not one considers Lüders' conclusions, which are based on the most thorough discussion of the materials yet made, totally convincing does not affect the grammatical question under discussion.

[45] Renou 1965:33 gives a compromise translation: 'parole-éloquente'.

[46] And also *-áyā*, as in *nāváyā*, 1.97.8ab: *sá naḥ sī́ndhumiva nāváyā́ti parṣā svastáye* '(Agni,) transport us to well-being as across a river by boat.' Grassmann 726 unnecessarily sets up a stem *nāvā́-* for this one form. Note that Kātyāyana (vt. 2 ad Pāṇ. 7.1.39) did recognize a suffix *-áyā* for *nāváyā*, just as Pāṇini (7.1.39) recognized an instrumental suffix *-yā́* for Vedic, as did APr. 4.30, VPr. 5.20. On the pronominal origin of *-áyā* (*káyā* 'how') see Wackernagel-Debrunner 77. Grassmann 190 also posits a stem *āsā́* to account for the adverbially accented instrumental *āsayā́* < *ās* 'mouth, face'.

[47] The functional equivalence of *-tā* and *-trā́* is sufficient to explain the long vowel of the latter, beside the locative suffix *-tra*.

[48] Cf. also *vasútā* in 6.1.13 (§ 2). Such *-tā* forms thus function like the instrumentals of abstracts in later Sanskrit, as in *ekaśrutadharatvena māṃ niścitya* 'When he saw that I retained what I heard once' (Kathāsaritsāgara 1.2.40); see Speyer § 117.2. Thus Sāyaṇa ad 5.48.5 glosses *puruṣatvátā* with *puruṣtvena* 'by virtue of humanness, as humans'. In 4.12.4ab: *yácciddhí te puruṣatrā́* ... *ácittibhiścakṛmā́ káccidā́gaḥ* 'If we

have through thoughtlessness ... committed any transgression against you', it is tempting to take *puruṣatrā́* to mean 'as men', equivalent to *puruṣátā* of the similar verse 4.54.3 by the same poet.

[49] On *vapuṣyá-* see Oldenberg 1912:125.

[50] Geldner translates in 1.183.2, 'Diese Rede soll schaulustig euer Schauspiel begleiten'. He considers that *vapuṣyā́* is to *vapuṣyà-* 'wonderful' as *śravasyā́* (§ 1.1d) is to *śravasyà-* 'famed'. But his translation seems to take *vapuṣyā́* as though it were a nominative construed with *gīḥ*. Renou 1958a:75 translates 'que ce chant (nôtre) accompagne votre apparition, lui-même (semblable à) une apparition', but he leaves the analysis of *vapuṣyā́* unclear.

[51] On *mitrín-* 'connected by pact' see Thieme 1957:42 fn. 30.

[52] Note that whereas *sukratūyā́* and *svapasyā́* would in this analysis refer to the subject of the sentence, this is not the case with *sukṛtyā́* in 4.35.7 (§ 1.3a) or *śraddhāmanasyā́* in 10.113.9 (§ 1.3d).

[53] Another example is *mahīyaí* in 1.113.6a 'for magnification, grandeur' (< *mahīyā́-*). Here, however, we must note that there is a verb *mahīyá-* 'be exalted, grand', so that the use of a haplologized form received support from dative infinitives of the type *daí* < *dā* 'give'; cf. Lanman 359, Renou 1957:47. Wackernagel 1957a:279 operates with straight haplology for *mahīyaí*, but see my § 4.

[54] On the nominals in *-tāt-* and *-tāti-* see Renou 1960b. I personally doubt the validity of the meaning 'sacrifice, service to the gods' for *devatā́t (i)*, but this question does not directly concern our discussion here. More important is the possibility that some of the haplologized forms of *devátā* were originally locatives (*devátātā*) of a *-tāti*-stem, thus contributing to the locative function of *-tā* < *-tātā*.

[55] Of other forms given as *-yā* instrumentals of *-yā́*-stems by Lanman 358, the following are to be eliminated: *agriyā́* (4.34.3, nom. sg. 'ahead'), *abdayā́* (5.54.3) probably 'as water givers' (cf. Renou 1962:86), *dhanyā́* (5.41.8) nom. sg. 'rich' (cf. Geldner, Renou 1959:20, and already Sāyaṇa, though he took it as a nominative in accusative function), *hiraṇyáyā* (7.66.8) instrumental of *hiraṇyáyī-* 'golden' (see Wackernagel-Debrunner 1930:117), *namasyā́* (2.33.8) imperative 'do obeissance' (see Oldenberg 1909a:ad loc.). Note that *pākyā̀* (read *pākiā́*) as a haplologic instrumental effectively rules out considering that in *suryā́yai* (*sūriā́yai*) 'for Sūryā' and the genitive-ablative *sūryā́yāḥ* (read *sūriā́yāḥ* in five of its eight occurrences) haplology did not occur because the forms were recited with *-i (y)ā́yai, -i (y)ā́yāḥ*. For haplologized *pākyā̀* we must also consider influence of *dhīryā̀* 'through wisdom' (< nt. *dhīryà-*), with which it occurs (2.27.11); see above, on *savyā́*. Note also that evidence has been cited for haplologized datives of the type *ratnadhéyā (ya)* 'for treasure'; see Wackernagel 1957a:280 and, against this explanation of such forms, Oldenberg 1909a:ad 4.34.1, 1909b.

[56] Nor can one totally discount the possibility of *-yā*-stem instrumentals with an ending *-ā*. Wackernagel-Debrunner's discussion (1930: 116-8) is too much bent on countering Lanman's classification.

[57] Debrunner 1954:618 recognizes an adverbial *-tvátā*. But an ad-

verbial *-tā* is unmistakable in the doublets *sasvár/sasvártā* 'in secret'.

[58] This also accords with the fact that, while the *-yā* instrumental-adverbial type occurs in Iranian (§ 2), there is no corresponding *-tā* in the same function in Iranian, though *-tāt*-stems are better attested there than in Indic (cf. Lichterbeck 177, Benveniste 19).

[59] This is the classical form. Homer only has forms of the stem *amphiphorēu-*. Mycenaean, however, has both *a-po-re-we* ⟨du.⟩ and *a-pi-po-re-we* (pl.); see Bennett 111.

[60] Brugmann 244 (§ 338) singles out as a case of haplology the genitive singular feminine of the Old Church Slavic definite adjective, type *novyję* 'new' (< *-jeję*). But the paradigm of such adjectives has other shortened forms, some of which can be the result of contraction (see Vaillant § § 265 [II.2.496 ff.], 81 [I.194 f.]). Moreover, the genitive *novyję* is formally identical with the nominative-accusative plural form, thus conforming to the pattern of *-ā*-stems (gen. sg., nom.-acc. pl. *ženy* < *žena-* 'woman') and *-ja*-stems (*zemlję* <*zemlja* 'earth'), where the genitive singular form is an analogic product (see Vaillant § 150 [II.1.81]).

[61] For *promisisti* it is sometimes possible to read *promisti;* see Goetz and Schoell ad Poen. 422, Rud. 1385. But for *promisti* it would also be possible to read *promisisti;* see Goetz and Schoell ad Curc. 705.

[62] Cf. *misti* and *promisse* in Catullus 14.14, 110.5, respectively.

[63] For the pertinent passages see Cardona 1965:7-8.

[64] This observation is important in view of the vogue enjoyed by Edgerton's law, which has led many Indo-Europeanists to operate with the generalization, under no ascertainable conditions, of different sandhi variants such as **tnew-, *tṇnew,* though the actual evidence does not warrant assuming such variation in the first place. For example, the only reconstruction indicated by positive evidence is **tṇnew-* (Skt. *tanóti* 'stretch', etc.), and Cowgill quite rightly says (1963:257 fn. 27) that the 'assumed alternants **kḷlew-, klew-* and **tṇnew- tnew-,* seem based on Edgerton's theories about the Indo-European resonants, and not on data.' Cowgill is obviously right in saying (loc. cit.): 'Rather than assuming very early generalization of Edgertonian alternants **klew-* and **tṇnew-* to account for the uniformity of Vedic *aśrot, tanú-,* Gk. *kléos, tanaós,* OCS *slovo, tĭnŭkŭ,* OIr. *clú, tanae,* NE *listen, thin,* etc., it seems reasonable to say that in Proto-Indo-European initial *tn-* simply did not occur, and that where one would expect it, *tṇn-* occurred instead.'

[65] I would mention here the recent work on syncope done by Szemerényi (1964), who rightly stresses (1964:404) the need for much more detailed work in the investigation of minor sound changes. The important thing is not simply to class changes such as haplology and syncope as minor, leaving one with a false sense of security concerning the major 'sound laws'. If the distinction between major and minor sound processes is not theoretically tenable, we can also abandon the propagandistic wording of the young grammarians, though of course not the reliance on the observable fact that, since languages are systems, changes in them are amenable to systematic treatment.

REFERENCES

Bartholomae, Christian. 1894-5. Vorgeschichte der Iranischen Sprachen. Awestasprache und Altpersisch. Grundriss der Iranischen Philologie I.1-248. Strassburg, Trübner

Bartsch, Karl and Leo Wiese. 1951. Chrestomathie de l'Ancien Français.[12] New York, Hafner

Bennett, Emmett L., Jr. 1958. The Mycenae Tablets II, with an Introduction by A.J.B. Wace and E.B. Wace. Translations and Commentary by J. Chadwick. (TAPS new series, vol. 48, part 2.) Philadelphia, The American Philosophical Society

Benveniste, Émile. 1960. Note Additionelle. BSL 55.18-9, see Renou 1960b

Blair, Chauncey. 1961. Heat in the Rig Veda and Atharva Veda. (American Oriental Series, vol. 45.) New Haven, AOS

Bloomfield, Leonard, 1932. Review of E. Hermann, Lautgesetz und Analogie. Lg. 8.220-33

———. 1933. Language. New York, Henry Holt and Company

Bloomfield, Maurice. 1906. A Vedic Concordance. (Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 10.) Cambridge, Harvard

———. 1916. Rig-Veda Repetitions. (HOS, vols. 20, 24.) Cambridge, Harvard

Braune, Wilhelm and Walter Mitzka. 1959. Althochdeutsche Grammatik.[9] Tübingen, Niemeyer

Brugmann, Karl. 1904. Kurze Vergleichende Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprachen (repr. 1933). Berlin, Leipzig, de Gruyter

Cardona, George. 1963. Greek *heîsa* and Sanskrit *sátsat*. Lg. 39.14-6

———. 1965. The Vedic imperatives in *-si*. Lg. 41.1-18

Cowgill, Warren. 1963. Review of Jaan Puhvel, Laryngeals and the Indo-European Verb. Lg. 39.248-69

Debrunner, Albert. 1954. Die Nominalsuffixe. (Volume II.2 of Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik.) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht

———. 1957a. Nachträge to Wackernagel 1957a

———. 1957b: Nachträge to Wackernagel 1957b

Delbrück, Berthold. 1888. Altindische Syntax. (Volume V of Syntaktische Forschungen.) Halle a. S., Waisenhaus

Geldner, Karl F. 1951. Der Rigveda aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt und mit einem laufenden Kommentar versehen. (Harvard Oriental Series, 33-5.) Cambridge, Harvard

Gonda, Jan. 1959. Epithets in the Ṛgveda. (Disputationes Rheno-Trajectinae, IV.) 's-Gravenhage, Mouton

———. 1963. The Vision of the Vedic Poets. (Disputationes Rheno-Trajectinae, VIII.) The Hague, Mouton

———. 1966. *Devayánt-* and *Devayú-*. Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda. 15.307-13

Grammont, Maurice. 1933. Traité de Phonétique. Paris, Delagrave

Grassmann, Hermann. 1872. Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda (repr. 1955). Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz

Hockett, Charles F. 1958. A Course in Modern Linguistics. New York, The Macmillan Company

Hoenigswald, Henry M. 1964. Graduality, Sporadicity, and the Minor Sound Change Process. Phonetica 11.202-15

Humbach, Helmut. 1959. Die Gāthās des Zarathustra, Band II, Kommentar. Heidelberg, Winter

Insler, Stanley. 1966. Vedic *tvāyā́*. IF 71.221-35 (publ. March, 1967).

Kurylowicz, Jerzy. 1945-9. La nature des procès dits "analogiques". Acta Linguistica 5.121-38. Cited from the reprint in E. Hamp, F. Householder, and R. Austerlitz (eds.), Readings in Linguistics II, 158-74. Chicago, 1966

Kent, Roland G. 1946. The Forms of Latin. Baltimore, Linguistic Society of America

Lanman, Charles R. 1880. A Statistical Account of Noun-Inflection in the Veda. JAOS 10.325-601

Lejeune, Michel. 1955. Traité de Phonétique Grècque². Paris, Klincksieck

Leumann, Manu. 1926. Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre. (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 2.2.1; repr. 1963.) München, Beck

Lichterbeck, Karl. 1895. Die Nominalflexion im Gathadialekt. KZ 33.169-213

Lodge, Gonzales. 1904-24. Lexicon Plautinum. Lipsiae, Teubner

Lommel, Hermann. 1942. Excurs zu Y. 34,15: *išud-, išud(h)ya-*. KZ 67.16-24

Lüders, Heinrich. 1951, 1959. Varuṇa. Aus dem Nachlass herausgegeben von Ludwig Alsdorf. (2 volumes, continuous pagination.) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht

Macdonell, A.A. 1910. Vedic Grammar. (Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie, I.4) Strassburg, Trübner

McGlynn, Patrick. 1963. Lexicon Terentianum, volume 1. London, Glasgow, Blackie and Sons

Meillet, Antoine. 1905-6. Comment les mots changent de sens. Cited from the reprint in A. Meillet, Linguistique historique et linguistique générale, 230-71. Paris, 1948.

———. 1937. Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes.⁸ Paris, Hachette

Merguet, H. 1877-84. Lexicon zu den Reden des Cicero. Jena, Fischer

———. 1887-94. Lexicon zu den Philosophischen Schriften Cicero's. Jena, Fischer

Narten, Johanna. 1964. Die Sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz

Niedermann, Max. 1945. Précis de phonétique historique du Latin². Paris, Klincksieck

Oldenberg, Hermann. 1909a. Ṛgveda. Textkritischen und exegetischen Noten. I. (Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl., NF Band XI, Nro. 5.)

———. 1909b. Vedische Untersuchungen. 29. Dative auf *-ā* und *-ai* von *-a*-Stämmen? ZDMG 63.287-93

———. 1912. Noten II. (Abh. ..., NF XIII.3.)

Oldfather, William A., Howard V. Canter, and Kenneth M. Abbot. 1938. Index Verborum Ciceronis Epistularum. Urbana, University of Illinois

Pischel, Richard. 1890. Review of Christian Bartholomae, Studien zur indogermanischen Sprachwissenschaft. GGA 1890.529-44

Renou, Louis. 1956. Études Védiques et Pāṇinéennes. Tome II. Paris, Boccard

———. 1957.EVP 3

———. 1958a: EVP 4

———. 1958b. Études sur le vocabulaire du Rgveda. Pondichéry, Institut Français d'Indologie

———. 1959. EVP 5

———. 1960a. EVP 7

———. 1960b. Les dérivés abstraits en *-tāt-* et *-tāti-* du Rgveda. BSL 55.10-7

———. 1961a. EVP 8

———. 1961b. EVP 9

———. 1962. EVP 10

———. 1964a. EVP 12

———. 1964b. EVP 13

———. 1965. EVP 14

Schmidt, Hanns-Peter. 1958. Vedisch *vratá* und awestisch *urvāta*. (Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 9.) Hamburg, de Gruyter

Schmidt, Johannes. 1889. Die Pluralbildungen der Indogermanischen Neutra. Weimar, Böhlau

Schwyzer, Eduard. 1903. Varia zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik. 1. Ein besonderer Fall von Haplologie im Griechischen. IF 14.24-7

———. 1911. Haplologie im Satzzusammenhang. IF 28.300

———. 1953. Griechische Grammatik, Erster Band, Allgemeiner Teil. Lautlehre. Wortbildung. Flexion. (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, II.1.1; mit Berichtigungen und Nachträge.) München, Beck

Sjoestedt, Marie-Louise. 1924, 1925. Les itératifs latins en *-tāre* (*-sāre*). BSL 25.153-73, 26.113-43

Sommer, Ferdinand. 1914. Handbuch der Lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre^2 (repr. 1948). Heidelberg, Winter

Speyer, J.S. 1896. Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax. (Grdr. d. Indo-Ar. Philologic und Altertumskunde, I.6.) Strassburg, Trübner

Szemerényi, Oswald. 1964. Syncope in Greek and Indo-European and the nature of Indo-European accent. AION, Sezione Linguistica, Quaderni, III, Naples

——. 1966. The origin of the Vedic 'imperatives' in *-si*. Lg. 42.1-6

Thieme, Paul. 1941. Beiträge zur Vedaexegese, 2. *śurudh*. ZDMG 95.338-49

———. 1949. Untersuchungen zur Wortkunde und Auslegung des Rigveda. Halle Salle, Niemeyer

———. 1951. *psu*. Beiträge zur Indischen Philologie und Altertumskunde. (Festschrift W. Schubring, Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 7.)

———. 1957. Mitra and Aryaman. Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences 41.1-96

Vaillant, André. 1950. Grammaire Comparée des Langues Slaves, I. Paris, IAC

———. 1958. Grammaire Comparée ... II.1, 2

Wackernagel, Jakob. 1907. Ai. *avṛk*. KZ 40.544-7 (= Wackernagel 1953:398-401)

———. 1910. Indoiranica. 2. Av. *ā* hinter *āi* des Dativs KZ 43.288-90 (= Wackernagel 1953:273-5)

———. 1932. Indoiranica. 6. Ai. *gṛh*. KZ 59.23-7 (= Wackernagel 1953:343-7)

———. 1953. Kleine Schriften von J. Wackernagel. Herausgegeben von der Ak. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen

———. 1957a. Altindische Grammatik I^2 with Introduction Générale by L. Renou and Nachträge by A. Debrunner. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht

———. 1957b. Altindische Grammatik II.1 with Nachträge by A. Debrunner

Wackernagel, Jakob and A. Debrunner. 1930. Altindische Grammatik III.

Sanskrit works with abbreviations

Atharvaveda-saṃhitā. ed. by Vishva Bandhu. Hoshiarpur (VVRI), 1960-64 [AV]

Atharvaveda Prātiśākhya. ed. and tr. by W.D. Whitney. JAOS 7.333-616 (1872) [APr.]

Mahābhāṣya. see Patañjali

Mahīdhara. see Vājasaneyi-saṃhitā

Maitrāyaṇī-saṃhitā. ed. by L. von Schroeder. Leipzig, 1881-6. [MS]

Nighaṇṭu. The Nighaṇṭu and the Nirukta. ed. by L. Sarup. University of the Punjab, 1927

Nirukta of Yāska. see Nighaṇṭu [Nir.]

Pāṇini. Aṣṭādhyāyī [Pāṇ.]

Patañjali. Vyākaraṇamahābhāṣya. ed. by F. Kielhorn. 3rd ed. revised by K. V. Abhyankar. vol. 1, 1962, vol. 2, 1965. Poona, BORI. vol. 3, 2nd ed., Poona, 1909 [References are to volume, page, and line]

Rigveda-saṃhitā with the commentary of Sāyaṇa. Poona (Vaidika Samshodhana Mandala), 1933-51 [RV]

Sāyaṇa. see Rigveda, Taittirīya-saṃhitā

Taittirīya-brāhmaṇa. with the commentary of Sāyaṇa. Poona (Ān.SS) 1934 [TB]

Taittirīya-saṃhitā. with the commentary of Sāyaṇa. Poona (Ān.SS) 1900-8 [TS]

Uvaṭa. see Vājasaneyi-saṃhita

Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya. ed. and tr. by A. Weber. IS 4.65-331 (1858) [VPr.]

Vājasaneyi-saṃhitā. with the commentaries of Uvaṭa and Mahīdhara. Benares (Kāś. SS) 1912-5

Yāska. see Nirukta

Abbreviations of Classical Works Cited

Cicero

Acad.	Academica
Caecin.	Ad Caecina
Div.	De Divinatione
Fam.	Epistulae ad Familiares
Fin.	De Finibus
N.D.	De Natura Deorum
Tusc.	Disputationes Tusculanae
Verr.	Contra Verres

Ovid

Her.	Heroides

Plautus

Asin.	Asinaria
Bacch.	Bacchae
Curc.	Curculio
Men.	Menaechmi
Merc.	Mercator
Mil.	Miles Gloriosus
Most.	Mostellaria
Poen.	Poenulus
Rud.	Rudens
St.	Stichus
Trin.	Trinummus

Terence

Ad.	Adelphoe
And.	Andria
Eun.	Eunuchus

Virgil

Aen.	Aeneid
Heaut.	Heautontimoroumenos
Hec.	Hecyra
Phorm.	Phormio

INDEX LOCORUM

(*Note:* This index includes only passages the text of which has been cited. For references to Sanskrit *-yā̆* forms see the Appendix, pp. 65–7. All references not otherwise specified are to pages.)

Rigveda
I.
  2.4: 19
  3.4: 19
  9.7: 17
  31.3: 27
  36.1: 36
  41.2: 39
  51.14: 14
  54.9: 29
  61.5: 17
  63.7: 24–5
  67.5: 27
  91.17: 42
  91.20: 15
  93.12: 37
  97.2: 16
  97.8: fn. 46
  101.4: 18–9
  101.8,9: 20
  114.3,9: 30, fn. 15
  116.5: fn. 7
  122.1: 31
  128.6: 17, fn. 12
  131.7: 42
  136.5: 34
  138.1,4: 18
  149.5: 17
  160.4: 27
  165.1: 16
  168.1: 31
  178.1: 38
  178.3: 42
  178.4: 41–2
  181.9: 23
  182.3: 21
  183.2: 41
  183.5: 35
II.
  10.6: 22
  11.12: 35
  11.16: 18
  18.6: 19, 38
  18.7: 19–20
  26.3: 28
  26.4: 25
  27.11: 45
  30.11: 18
  35.1: 36–7
  38.2: 38
III.
  1.4: 40–1
  1.17,18: 27
  2.8: 20
  3.11: 26
  33.8: 40
  37.3: 36
  41.7: 19
  42.6: fn. 14
  45.5: 42
  46.5: 38
  53.15: 33
  60.3: 26
IV.
  1.12: 30
  2.6: 20, 33
  2.9: 20–1
  2.14: 20
  4.14: 33–4
  8.6: 21

12.4: fn. 48
16.15: 16
17.16: 14
24.1: 28
24.2: 22
24.3: 28
24.4: 28
32.11: fn. 42
35.2: 25–6
35.4,7: 26
35.8: fn. 31
35.9: 26
36.6: 22
36.9: 17
54.3: 40
V.
  6.1–10: 57
  14.6: 21–2
  24.4: 31
  32.12: 32
  36.6: 21
  40.7: 29
  41.16: 32
  43.8: 41
  43.15: 32
  48.5: 40
  50.1: 30–1
  52.3: 35–6
  73.2: 24
VI.
  1.13: 33–4
  15.6: 20
  15.10: 27, fn. 29
  21.1: 36
  26.6: 29
  27.6: 16
  40.3: 19
  44.7: 25
  46.10: 19
  49.8: 22
  49.11: 24
  52.15: 35
  62.1,2: 24
  63.4: fn. 43
  68.1: 37
VII.
  3.9: 38
  18.1: 33–4
  18.4: 37
  18.11: 16
  18.17: fn. 4
  23.1: 17
  27.5: 13
  29.3: 33
  31.3: 14
  32.2: 32
  32.23: 14
  32.26: 28
  33.5: fn. 4
  34.17: 32
  39.3: fn. 29
  57.4: 40
  75.8: 40
  77.5: fn. 2
  85.3: 39
  90.1: 15
  92.3: 15
  99.3: 23
  100.4: 22–3
VIII.
  6.33: 37
  8.16: 16
  13.3: 42
  16.11–2: fn. 9
  18.20: 31
  19.10: 39
  32.1: 30
  46.10: 14
  60.7: 36
  69.2: 30
  75.11: 25
  78.9: 16
  81.3: 29
  81.5: fn. 17
  93.16–7: 15
  93.19–20: 57

IX.
  9.9: fn. 5
  11.8: 38
  11.9: fn. 5
  18.4: fn. 12
  20.4: 57
  36.6: 14
  64.3: 15
  64.4: 14
  70.2: 27
  75.2: 21
  82.2: 28
  96.16: 17
  97.44: 15
  98.3: 49
  98.4: fn. 5
  99.6: 21
X.
  11.6: 25
  15.6: 40
  27.5: 29
  42.2: fn. 3
  43.2: 32
  49.2: 39
  51.5: 34
  61.5: fn. 42
  64.2: 27–8
  70.1: 34, fn. 43
  72.1: 29–30
  80.4: 33
  101.4: 18
  103.6: fn. 7
  113.8: 22
  113.9: 28–9
  122.2: 27
  122.6: 26–7
  128.5: fn. 7
  147.2: 17
  174.2: fn. 36
Atharvaveda
  7.55.1: 32
  13.2.9: 49
Vājasaneyisaṃhitā
  4.34: fn. 1
Maitrāyaṇīsaṃhitā
  1.2.9: fn. 23
Taittirīyasaṃhitā
  1.2.2.1: fn. 39
  1.2.13.12: fn. 23
Nirukta
  6.31: fn. 1
Chāndogyopaniṣad
  7.4.1: fn. 35
Mahābhārata
  4.67.6: fn. 42
Kathāsaritsāgara
  1.2.40: fn. 47
Hesiod.
  Aspis 253–4: 49
Plautus.
  Asin. 251: 51
  Curc. 490, 709: 53
  Men. 1146: 53
  Mer. 993: 52
  Most. 548, 552: 52
  St. 395: 51
  Trin. 555, 567: 52
Terence.
  Ad. 348–9: 52
  And. 593: 52
  Eun. 322: 53
    376: 52
    831: 53
  Heaut. 31–2: 52
  Hec. 451, 845: 52
Virgil.
  Aen. 1.200–1: 52